24-B

129-3

15

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5133 .B5 1804 v.2
Blackburne, Francis, 1705-1787.
The works, theological and miscellaneous-- of Francis

ت

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/workstheological02blac

THE

WORKS,

THEOLOGICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

Including some pieces not before printed,

OF

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, M.A.

LATE RECTOR OF RICHMOND,

AND ARCHDEACON OF CLEVELAND;

With some account

OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF THE AUTHOR, BY HIMSELF,

COMPLETED BY HIS SON

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, L.L.B.

And illustrated by an Appendix of Original Papers.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LIBERABIT VERITAS.

Cambridge;

PRINTED BY B. FLOWER, FOR THE EDITOR:

SOLD BY CADELL AND DAVIES, STRAND; CONDER, BUCKLERSBURY; HURST, PATERNOSTER-ROW; AND MAWMAN, POULTRY, LONDON; DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; AND TODD, YORK.

1804.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

PAGE

A Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter to the Right Honourable Horatio Walpole, concerning bishops in America - - 3

A Letter written by a Country Clergyman, to Archbishop Herring - - - 101

An Apology for the Authors of a Book, intitled, Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England, &c. wherein the Contents of the first Letter of Remarks on that Treatise, by a Presbyter of the Church of England, are particularly examined - - - 135

No Proof in the Scriptures of an intermediate State of Happiness or Misery between Death and the Resurrection. In Answer to Mr. Goddard's Sermon, preached at St. Edmunds-Bury, Feb. 25th. 1756. To which are added, Remarks on a Letter in the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1756, and on a paragraph in a Sermon of Archbishop

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Tillotson's. With a Postscript, in answer to some Remarks upon a late Treatise relating to the Intermediate State, &c - - 179

Remarks on Dr. Warburton's Account of the Sentiments of the early Jews concerning the Soul: occasioned by some passages in a late book intituled,—A Free and Candid Examination of the principles advanced in the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London's very elegant Sermons lately published, &c - 261

A Review of some Passages in the last edition of the Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated. By the Author of Remarks on Dr. Warburton's Account of the sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul, &c. To which are added, a Defence of the above-mentioned Remarks against the objections of Caleb Fleming. And a second Postscript occasioned by the said Mr. Fleming's late Advertisement, &c - - - 339

A CRITICAL

COMMENTARY

ON

ARCHBISHOP SECKER's LETTER

TO THE

Right Honourable HORATIO WALPOLE,

CONCERNING

BISHOPS in AMERICA.

——— *Meditor esse affabilis,*
Et bene procedit. ———
Paulatim plebem primulùm facio meam.

[FIRST PRINTED, MDCC LXX.]

A CRITICAL

COMMENTARY, &c.

BEFORE we examine the contents of this remarkable letter to Mr. Walpole, it will be necessary to consider some circumstances relative to the occasion on which it was written, the time when, and the reason why it was published.

Archbishop Secker, being himself a very sincere convert from the religious errors in which he had been educated in the early part of his life, and zealously attached to that system which he afterwards embraced, appears, by many tokens, to have been solicitous to convince those whom he had left, of their dangerous delusions, and to bring as many of them as he could influence, over to the church in which he himself had found so much satisfaction.

With these sentiments, and in this attachment to them, it is not at all surprising, that his grace should be deeply enamoured of this project of establishing bishops in our American colonies. By some intimations in his sermon preached before *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign Parts,* February 20, 1741, it appears, that the accomplishment of it had early taken possession of his grace's

affections; and from the tenor of his conduct and conversation from that time to the hour of his death, we may safely conclude, Mr. Walpole's letter must have been a precious morsel to him, as it gave him an opportunity of figuring on his favourite subject before a minister of state.

Mr. Walpole's letter, we are informed by an advertisement prefixed to the bishop's, was written in the year 1750, to the late Dr. Sherlock then bishop of London. It does not appear that bishop Sherlock gave any answer to it, either by word or writing. Bishop Secker indeed *supposes* "that if my lord of London "had ever conversed with Mr. Walpole on the "subject, since he received Mr. Walpole's let-"ter, he had *doubtless* said every thing mate-"rial by way of reply;" yet nothing of this sort appears, and as nothing in writing by way of answer from Dr. Sherlock to Mr. Walpole was known to Dr. Secker*, the more probable supposition is, that bishop Sherlock, convinced by Mr. Walpole's letter of the danger, the folly, or at least of the inexpedience of the project, made no reply at all.

But the moment it is communicated to Dr. Secker, he eagerly seizes the opportunity, and attempts to answer the statesman's objections; very little, one would think, to that gentleman's satisfaction, who from the beginning of the year 1751, to the day of his death, seems to have let this letter lie quietly by him, as other schemes might do with other ministers of state, who should be in no disposition to be

* See his Letter, p. 1.

amused with the visionary proposals of weak or designing projectors.

But since his grace's executors, in compliance with his fiat of May 25, 1759, have thought fit to revive this letter, may we not ask, what is become of Mr. Walpole's letter to bishop Sherlock? That Dr. Secker, and consequently his executors, had it in their power to publish Mr. Walpole's letter, is very probable. If any circumstances made it either impracticable or improper to publish that letter, candor and common justice required, that this answer to it should have been suppressed for the same length of time. If the public had any claim upon archbishop Secker for his sentiments concerning american bishops, they had likewise a right to the whole process which drew those sentiments from him. Mr. Walpole's letter might have objections in it, which archbishop Secker did not think proper to touch, and his grace could not be uninformed, that to publish answers to treatises, which they who should judge between the parties have no possible means of consulting, has always been a standing and a very reasonable prejudice against the fairness and impartiality of the answerers.

As Mr. Walpole's letter is thus withheld, we can only conjecture, that it might be occasioned by some previous conversation between himself and the bishop of London, concerning bishops in America. It is very unlikely Mr. Walpole should begin the subject. Ministers of state were then said to be particularly cautious of giving offence to the colonists, and these, they could not but know, had no predi-

lection for episcopacy. The colonists on the other hand, who were members of the church of England, were more especially within the bishop of London's episcopal department. It was therefore natural enough for his Lordship to propose an improvement of their religious condition. It was his peculiar business to remove, as far as he could, all obstacles to it, and consequently to answer Mr. Walpole's letter. He did not answer it. He plainly thought it unnecessary.

How then came this province to be turned over to the bishop of Oxford? If we look no farther than the advertisement before the pamphlet, there is some appearance of a reason for it. We are there informed, that Mr. Walpole's letter was communicated to bishop Secker, by the bishop of London: and hence it might seem, that the Bishop of London, having either less leisure, or less ability, left Mr. Walpole in the hands of his brother of Oxford. But in the very first page of this answer, bishop Secker says, Mr. Walpole's letter was communicated to him by Mr. Walpole himself; nor does he seem to know any thing at all of the bishop of London's sentiments on the subject of that letter. It may therefore be surmised, that bishop Secker was set to work merely by his own alacrity in so good a cause.

There is little doubt but the editors of this letter think themselves well justified in executing his grace's order for printing it after his death, as well as in taking an early opportunity to do it: and yet, might they not have had a reasonable apology for demurring to that order at this particular juncture, when any attempt

at religious innovations in our colonies, seems to be highly unseasonable?

At the 15th page of this letter, his grace moves a question, "whether the appointment "of bishops in the colonies, would not stir up "dangerous uneasinesses abroad or at home?"

There is I think little doubt but that these uneasinesses had been represented to bishop Sherlock, by Mr. Walpole (who had very good opportunities of knowing) as the inevitable consequences of such an appointment.

But whatever of this kind might then be apprehended, archbishop Secker lived to see uneasinesses in the colonies of a very different nature from any that were dreamt of eighteen years ago: such indeed as might have suggested to him, that nothing could be more unseasonable, than the trying his favourite experiment at a time when every wise and good man, and every well-wisher to the peace and prosperity of his Majesty's government, saw how necessary it was to avoid all occasions of irritating the british colonies of America. His grace's arguments, in answer to the question abovementioned, whatever weight they might have in 1751, or even in 1759, are lighter than vanity itself, when applied to the state of things in 1768: and whoever peruses a tenth part of the pamphlets which have appeared, during the late altercations on colony-subjects, will easily perceive, that the publication of such a letter as this, in the midst of these jarrings, would be adding fuel to the flame. And yet the written order for the printing of it had laid by his grace, as appears, from 1759 to the time of his death, without one reflection of the very ill

effects it might have when he was gone: and could his executors think of doing any honour to his grace's prudence, his charity, or his moderation, by exposing to the public his grace's earnestness for advancing his project, at the hazard of so much confusion as must have attended any attempt to execute it at that time?

Perhaps it may be said, that as our colony-disputes did not commence till some years after 1759, his grace, through the importance and multiplicity of other affairs, might forget he had made an order for printing this piece after his death; but this I think will hardly be allowed by those who consider, what daily occurred in the news papers, concerning the project of episcopizing America; or if it might be supposed that these were below his grace's notice, the existence of such an order could not possibly escape his memory during his grace's controversy with Dr. Mayhew, in which some of the same topics are exhibited on the part of his grace, that we find in this letter to Mr. Walpole; and as the subject has been kept in public view, more or less, to this very time, there cannot be the least doubt but the archbishop was conscious of this order, as long as he was conscious of any thing.

However, since this letter must be published, it was not unwisely done to postpone it till after his grace's decease. How aptly soever the contents of it might have come in aid of his grace's other arguments for american episcopacy, he saw no doubt the additional imputations it must have brought him under, from his petulant reflections upon our domestic dissenters, not to mention the danger of a more

mortifying reproof for throwing a bone of contention when and where the parties concerned were sufficiently exasperated without it.

What shall we say for his grace on this occasion? Shall we offer the apology that one of his admirers hath suggested for his intermeddling in the expulsion of the Oxford students? *viz.* "A body labouring under great infirmi-
"ties, and a mind perhaps sympathising with
"it, and his not possessing in their full vigour
"those great faculties, for which he was once
"so eminently distinguished.*"

But if this apology for his grace is accepted, what must be said for the editors of the letter in question? Must not these infirmities of body and mind have been more familiarly known to them, than to others who had no particular connections at Lambeth? Will his grace's order sufficiently excuse them to the public for a production of this nature, *born* so much *out of due time?* It had been sufficient for their scruples on the peremptoriness of the order, to have printed the letter, and to have withheld the publication, till times more favourable to the cause it pleads. It is remarkable, that just before it was advertised, the public prints gave us notice, that our colony-disputes were upon the point of being adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties; and this was the more credible, as it was announced by writers who were understood to be retained as advocates for the administration.† At this

* Strictures on Dr. Nowel's answer to *Pietas Oxonienſis*, page 37, 38.

† Particularly by an Eſſayiſt who figured more than once under the name of CREON.

critical juncture, could there be any laudable, any excusable motive for publishing these papers so full fraught with provocation to our dissenters at home, as well as their brethren in the colonies abroad? And will not this inconsiderate deference for his grace's commands, justify the enemies of the church in a common observation, that, provided the dignity and emoluments of the hierarchy are but maintained, no matter what becomes of the civil interest of the community; and will not the editors, as well as the author, come in for their share of this reproach?

Pass we on from these preliminary remarks, to the contents of the letter.

"The thing proposed," says Dr. Secker, "is, "that two or three persons should be ordained "bishops, and sent into our American colonies, "to administer confirmation, and to give dea-"con's and priest's orders to proper candidates; "and exercise such jurisdiction over the clergy "of the church of England, in those parts, as "the late bishop of London's commissaries did; "or such as it might be thought proper that "any future commissaries should, if this design "were not to take place." *Page* 2.

By the alternative in the latter part of this proposal, it should seem, that, "if this design "were not to take place," it might be thought proper to vest the future commissaries of the bishop of London with larger powers of jurisdiction, than the late commissaries had enjoyed, in order to supply the want of episcopal jurisdiction. To what this new jurisdiction of the future commissaries would amount, we are not informed. It is left indefinite. This we may

safely conclude, that it would *not* be thought proper to limit the jurisdiction of bishops to any thing less than it may be thought proper the future commissaries should exercise; and this might, probably would be, the full jurisdiction exercised by the bishops of the mother country. What effect this discovery will have, upon some other proposals in this letter, we shall see presently. In the mean time we proceed with the writer of it.

"The questions," saith Dr. Secker, "which "arise on this proposal, are, is it a reasonable "proposal in itself? And if it be, are there "any such dangers of its being extended to "introduce exorbitant church powers, or of "raising uneasinesses abroad or at home, as "may notwithstanding, at least for the present, "be just objections against it?"*

His grace sets out with insinuating, that, "Mr. Walpole seemed to allow the reasonable-"ness of the proposal, abstractedly considered." But as this only *seems* to have been the case, we cannot judge under what abstraction Mr. Walpole allowed the reasonableness of the proposal. This could only be learned from his letter to which we have no access.

Dr. Secker argues for the reasonableness of the proposal from what belongs to the very nature of episcopal churches; and concerning this matter, Mr. Walpole might very widely differ from the Doctor. Mr. Walpole might be of opinion, that many things belong to the nature of episcopal churches, which the bishops of England do not bring into practice. He

* Page 2.

might ask the bishop of London, whether the bishops of England enjoyed any privileges, or exercised any jurisdiction, which do not belong to the very nature of episcopal churches? If yea, it seems expedient to retrench these in the first place, as mere usurpations, seeing that no edification can arise from the exercise of such powers and privileges. If, on the other hand, the english bishops exercise no jurisdiction which does not belong to the nature of episcopal churches, and if it is reasonable to send bishops to America, it must be reasonable to send them with the powers and privileges which belong to the very nature of the churches over which they are intended to preside. That is to say, with the powers and privileges exercised and enjoyed by the bishops of England. But this Dr. Secker did not desire we should believe. Why was he not then more explicit concerning the jurisdiction it might be thought proper the new bishops should exercise in America?

"It belongs," says Dr. Secker, "to the very "nature of episcopal churches to have bishops, "at proper distances, presiding over them."* Not only that, but it belongs to the nature of episcopal churches to have bishops at certain distances, that is to say, within certain districts called dioceses, presiding over them, and consequently residing among them. For it must be remembered, that there are certain things belonging to the nature of the episcopal office, as well as to the nature of episcopal churches, one of which is vigilance over the flock of which the bishop takes the charge,

* Page 3.

which cannot be exercised while he is absent from them, either in England or America: and this is equally true, whether the bishop is distant some hundreds, or some thousands of miles from his diocese: and yet we know the inhabitants of some of our dioceses, are, in this respect, no better accommodated than the inhabitants of America, for three parts of the year out of four.

If it should be said, english bishops can perform the necessary acts of vigilance by their officers stationed in the diocese; even so may the bishop of London by his commissaries stationed in America.

"But," it is alledged, "that there are episcopal acts, which must be performed by "bishops in person;" and of these the first instance is that of confirmation.

Shall we then lay it down for a rule, that it belongs to the nature of episcopal churches, that all their members should be confirmed? If it does not, the colonists may do without it. And that it does not, appears from the practice, and indeed from the constitution of the church of England. In several dioceses there are no confirmations for several years. When confirmation is administered, it is to children or young persons, from the age of thirteen to sixteen inclusive.

By canon CXII. if persons of the age of sixteen do not communicate, they are to be presented to the archbishop, by the minister, churchwardens, &c. In consequence of this canon, thousands receive the communion who were never confirmed, because they never had an opportunity: and when such communi-

cants present themselves for confirmation, they are told, it is not proper, after they have communicated; which shews, that how useful soever confirmation may be, where it can be had, where it cannot, it is, by the constitution of the church of England herself unnecessary: and after this, would it be sufficiently respectful to my lords the bishops, or indeed to our excellent establishment to say, that such and such people, of Cumberland for instance, or Northumberland, or the welch counties, are denied confirmation, unless they will go to London for it? or that they are in effect prohibited the exercise of one part of their religion.*

With respect to ordination, there are two expedients in use at present for furnishing the colonists of the church of England with ministers of their own communion. 1. By ordaining natives of America who come to England for that purpose. 2. By sending english ministers to the colonies from hence.

As to the first of these, Dr. Secker observes, that "sending their sons to so distant a climate "must be very inconvenient and disagreeable, "and taking the small-pox here is said to be "peculiarly fatal to them;" *i. e.* peculiarly to the persons who come here for orders: for whenhis grace mentions a little below, that, "their young men of fashion would still come "to England for polite accomplishments," no apprehensions of what would be inconvenient or disagreeable to them, are expressed, nor any mention made of any peculiar fatality of the small-pox to such young men.

* Letter, page 3.

"The expence also," says his grace, "must "be grievous to persons of small fortunes, such "as most are who breed up their children for "orders; and yet not sufficient to bring any "accession of wealth to this nation that would "be worth naming, were more of that rank to "come."*

From the cast of this answer, one may conjecture, that Mr. Walpole had objected to american bishops, that such a measure would prevent the colonists from coming hither, and spending their money among us. To obviate this, his grace was obliged to suppose, that none would send their sons to England to be ordained, but persons in mean circumstances. But I am inclined to believe that the statesman's objection would strike a little deeper, and that the consideration with him might be, that the more inducements the colonists in general should have to stay at home, and the fewer occasions of personal intercourse with the mother country, the more they would aspire to independency; a matter of very serious consideration among the ministers of those times†.

The statesman, no doubt, argued, that if the colonists of the church of England were impowered to manufacture deacons and priests for themselves, as well as other things, which

* Letter, page 4.

† I have been informed, that the late Archbishop Secker, being in conference with an eminent colonist, desired to know of him, if his countrymen would be averse to the sending a bishop among them? *Pray, my Lord,* said the gentleman, *can one bishop make another?* Undoubtedly, *replied* his Grace. *Why then, my Lord,* rejoined the colonist, *you may send your bishop as soon as you please, it will be one considerable step towards our living without you.* Here the conversation was dropped.

they have hitherto imported from hence, they would in time have a church independent upon that in the mother country; a consideration of ten times more importance to Mr. Walpole, than the money that would be gained by a few young men coming to England for orders, or that would be lost by their staying away.

2. With respect to the clergymen of the church of England who are sent from hence, it must be a matter of great concern to all who wish well to the interests and credit of the establishment, to be told by an archbishop of Canterbury, that few of them, in proportion, "can answer the end for which they are de-"signed."* That the rest are "men of des-"perate fortunes, low qualifications, bad and "doubtful characters, and a great part of them "scotch Jacobites." Is this for the honour of the society which sends them? How greatly does this representation detract from the credibility of those accounts they give us from time to time, of the success of their labours in our plantations; which depend, in a great measure, on the veracity of these wretched characters? When the public is solicited, as is often the case, to supply the deficiency of the society's funds, by their charitable contributions, will they not be apt to consider, before they give their money, upon what sort of men it is to be expended.

And how would the matter be mended by sending bishops instead of priests? Every consideration drawn from the nature of the service, the danger of the voyage, absence from

* Page 4.

family-connexions, &c. which at present serves to discourage private clergymen of easy fortunes, good learning, sound principles, and respectable characters, would operate with equal force upon the mind of a destined bishop, and create the same reluctance that other men have shewn to engage in such an adventure.

Would his grace have said in answer to this, that a larger stipend, an increase of power, and a more respectable title, would have engaged more reputable candidates? I am afraid this would be only saying, that ambition and avarice are more reputable motives for accepting the office of a christian bishop, than the prospect of a bare maintenance is for taking the province of an ordinary teacher. His grace could hardly think that the colonists are so much strangers to human nature, as not to be aware, that these dispositions are common to clergymen and others, both of higher and lower ranks; and that, with respect to bishops sent from England to America, the same hazards must be run by the senders, to which the propagating society is liable in dispatching common missionaries. So that all the good things his grace augurates from the appointment of colony-bishops would effectually be frustrated, if the bishops were no better men (a point his grace could by no means insure to the colonists) than the missionaries he speaks of.

His grace proposes great benefit, and considerable reformation among both the conforming clergy and laity in our colonies, by substituting natives for their ordinary pastors,

instead of "vagabond strangers:" (as he call the missionaries sent from England.) But if native ministers would so much improve the religious state of our church of England colonists, why not native bishops? I ask this question, because it appears to me, that his grace never dreamt of supplying the mortality of colony bishops, otherwise than by recruits from England. Probably his grand point could not be gained any other way. Otherwise a native of some of the colonies, not liable to the fatality of the small-pox, or to much inconvenience of another sort, might come over and be consecrated once for all in England. Or an english or an irish bishop might be found without much difficulty, who would undertake the voyage, without the mortifying alternative of bidding a final adieu to his european connections; and, having consecrated one or more proper persons from among the natives, might return home, and leave the colonists to improve their religious state upon this new institution, as they found occasion. Here indeed would be additional encouragement to parents to breed their children to the church,—still more convenient opportunities of providing for them handsomely, and even to build and endow, not only churches and parsonage houses, but cathedrals and bishop's palaces, in which good works they would hardly shew so much alacrity, if they found the honour, emolument, and power appropriated to bishops sent in succession from England.

And what, I desire to know, would hinder a bishop sent from England from appearing to the colonists in the light of a "vagabond strang-

er," any more than a common missionary? And would he be more likely, with this stigma upon him, to answer any of the good ends proposed by his grace, more effectually than any other clergyman of the same country? And this being the case, all that is proposed by his grace in sending bishops from hence, is a mere empty chimerical vision, which deserves not the least regard.

Mr. Walpole must have been a weak politician indeed, if he did not see that bishops sent from England would increase the evils complained of, rather than remedy them. He must have been sensible, or if he was not, we may be at this hour, that the colonists, were they inclined to admit a prelatical hierarchy among them (which he very well knew none of them were) would never be satisfied without having the whole ordering of it themselves, any more than they chuse to be controled in some other things: and least of all would they submit to be governed by english bishops.

One of the blessed effects of the reformation proposed by his grace (in my opinion the principal one in his estimation) was the conversion of the dissenters. Accordingly, he strains every nerve to magnify the advantages of this event to the public, in a political view.

"If," saith his grace, "by reforming them "(the colonists of the church of England) and "introducing better order into the churches "of our communion, more of the inhabitants "should come over to it, as they naturally "will, this would be a further public benefit. "For the members of the church of England

" will think themselves more connected with " England, than others."*

Have then the non-conforming colonists no dissenting brethren, no kindred, no commercial interests, no king in England? Have they less connection, or fewer attachments to England, on these and other accounts, than the conformists themselves? If this had been insinuated by a less venerable character than that of an archbishop, I should have been tempted to say, that the man must either be contemptible for his ignorance, or of an abandoned assurance, who should venture such a suggestion among those who know the truth of the case.

His grace goes on. " And supposing them " not to be jacobites, their acknowledgment " of the king's supremacy, will incline them " to be dutifuller subjects than the dissenters, " who do not acknowledge it.†"

Supposing them not to be jacobites! Whom does he mean? plainly the converts from among the dissenters. But whoever accused the nonconformists in the colonies of jacobitism, even any one man among them? There is therefore not the least colour for this supposition, unless we suppose that these converts become jaco-

* Page 5. I had good grounds for affirming, that the conformists in the colonies in general, so far from being more inclined to keep up their connections with the mother country, never did so much by a thousand times, for the sake of it, as the dissenters ever did, before, and for years after this letter was written. This however is not meant to exclude some particular public-spirited conformists. Who they were, and of what communion, who were chiefly instrumental in the late misunderstandings between the colonies and the mother country, I have no inclination to inquire.

† Page 6.

bites as soon as they become conformists; which is no very desirable effect of the episcopal reformation here held forth.

On another hand, his grace has more than supposed that most of the scotch missionaries are jacobites. But every one knows that all these, to be duly qualified for their office, must acknowledge the king's supremacy upon oath: a plain proof that the greater or less dutifulness of the subject does not depend upon such acknowledgment.

But, "the dissenters do not acknowledge "the king's supremacy." I am confident that this is a mere malevolent misrepresentation, and that there is not one dissenter in the colonies, who denies the king to be his supreme governor; and I am persuaded the same may be said for every protestant dissenter in Great Britain.

The true case is this. The protestant dissenters hold, that the civil magistrate hath no authority to interfere in matters of religion, which do not affect the safety of his government, so far as the private judgment or conscience of his subjects is concerned, whether considered as individuals, or united in religious society: and this they hold, not merely with respect to the authority of a king or a monarch as such, but of the aggregate power of legislature however constituted. And is this principle peculiar to dissenters? Has it not been, is it not still the principle of as wise, learned, and worthy conformists as ever existed? Was it not the principle of *Locke*, *Burnet*, *Clarke*, *Hoadly*, and others of the last generation? And had the kings or queens

of those times when these men flourished, *dutifuller* subjects (to use his grace's elegant language) than these illustrious persons, in the kingdom? Does not the artificial author of the *Alliance in church and state*, inform us, that this was the principle on which the toleration act was grounded? And would his grace himself have ventured to say, had he been catechised on this head, that it was not his own principle too?

I ask his pardon: I did not think of a passage in this letter, *page* 13. where his grace believes, "his majesty hath not a right to or-"der the bishop of London to recall his com-"missaries." And if so, the supremacy, according to his grace's creed, must, in this instance, be in the bishop of London, and not in the king.

For the rest, if it was ever understood that the protestant dissenters denied the king's supremacy, as opposed to the supremacy of the pope, or of any foreign potentate, it is more than I ever heard. In the mean time, it is well known, that the dissenters scruple not to put themselves under the protection of the law, as their dernier resort, whenever they apprehend their rights, even as a religious society, to be infringed, or attempted, as was lately notorious in the case of a dissenter named to the office of sheriff of London, which received its decision in the supreme court of judicature of Great Britain.

2. We are now come to the second question, namely, "whether the danger of increasing "church power, by the means of establishing

" bishops in America, is not a sufficient ob-
" jection against the project?"

In the outset of his letter, his grace talks of " jurisdiction over the clergy, not only such " as the late bishop of London's commissaries " did exercise, but such as it might be thought " proper future commissaries should exercise, " if this design of episcopising, should not " take place." An insinuation that is utterly inconsistent with his grace's declaration, that, " confirming and ordaining are the only new " powers that will be exercised."* These powers of confirming and ordaining, the commissaries never had; nor, tenacious as our prelates have always been of reserving these powers to themselves, is it probable they will ever consent that future commissaries should be invested with them. The jurisdiction, therefore, that it may be thought proper these future commissaries should exercise, must signify that enlargement of church power on which the objection is founded: and as this enlargement is intended as a succedaneum, in the room of episcopal power, few people will be persuaded it will be less obnoxious in the hands of bishops, than it would be in the hands of commissaries.

His grace, therefore, may much more safely be believed, when he says, that, "strictly " speaking, it can never be promised, in any " case, that no additional powers shall here- " after be proposed and pressed on the colo- " nies," than when he says, "no other juris- " diction is desired for the proposed bishops,

* Page 6.

"than the preceding commissaries have en-
"joyed."

And yet I know not whether we may not safely take his grace's word, even for this last particular. Right and title, are very different things from actual enjoyment; and if the colonists may be believed, these same commissaries have both enjoyed and exercised pretended powers of jurisdiction, highly injurious and oppressive to the inhabitants, without any apparent authority for it.

And of this his grace seems to have been conscious; else why should his grace have added, "and even that" [the jurisdiction enjoyed by former commissaries] "on this occasion, "may be ascertained and limited, more accu-
"rately, if it be requisite."* But will it ever be thought requisite, by those who think as his grace did, that the jurisdiction of a bishop should be ascertained or limited to any mark below that at which the jurisdiction of a commissary hath been enjoyed? And indeed, does not this gracious concession seem to imply that the jurisdiction which these commissaries have enjoyed, was in fact, unascertained and unlimited?

His grace supposes, "it would have been equally right to have opposed the toleration act, on the apprehension, that more, in consequence of this concession, might have been pressed upon the government in favour of the dissenters, as to oppose the settlement of bishops in America, from a presumption of increasing the power of the church."†

* Page 6. † Page 7.

But, I conceive, the cases are widely different. Whatever is pressed upon government in favour of the dissenters, will always be subject to the control of parliament. Whereas his grace tells us, *(page* 21.*)* "There seems no "necessity that this affair" [of establishing american bishops] "should ever come into "parliament." The bishops, according to his grace, "would be appointed by the crown, and "will be such persons as the crown can best "confide in." *(Page* 13.*)* This looks as if the crown was to have an interest in these bishops, distinct from the interest of the public; and should it appear in process of time that the limited powers with which these bishops should be sent out at the first, would be insufficient for the political purposes of the crown, can it be doubted but that they would be immediately enlarged? and can any man suppose that pretences for it would not be furnished by our bishops (the only solicitors of the project that the letter points out) *viz.* "that it would be a disparagement of the order, to have bishops in any part of his majesty's dominions, vested with less power than the bishops of the mother country:—that it belonged to the nature of episcopal churches, that their bishops should have full powers to correct the transgressions as well of the laity as the clergy; and that without these powers in their bishops, the conforming colonists would not have the full exercise of their religion:"—would not these pleas be full as forceable for enlarging those powers, as they are now for appointing the bishops themselves? Forceable, I mean to the crown, whose particular confidants these american bi-

shops are to be: and what or who would there be to say nay to the proposal, the crown having the power, and the bishops the will, to have it carried into execution.

But had his grace reflected ever so little upon what passed in parliament before the toleration act was obtained for the dissenters, his grace might have easily perceived, that it was the utmost that could be obtained for them; and that king William never could prevail to have them brought into civil offices, but under the restrictions of the test act; and that the very order of men, who would, as the case above is stated by his grace, have so much influence towards enlarging the power of american bishops, have hitherto had sufficient interest to prevent any farther favours, particularly, any thing hurtful to the established church, from being conferred on the dissenters.

His grace however assures us, that no such thing is intended as pressing for *additional* powers to american bishops; and in this assertion he thinks there are no grounds to question the sincerity of his grace and his brethren.

But on this head of sincerity, I think it was as much as could be reasonably expected of his grace, to answer for himself; for assuredly he could offer no satisfactory proof that others of his brethren might not intend, what he did not; and about the time when he thus undertook to answer for them, it is certain there were bishops who were "thought to be peculiarly fond of church-power," and who when "they were called upon to answer for themselves," gave very little satisfaction by their defences.

His grace's great argument for this sincerity is, the moderation of his contemporaries. To which I shall say nothing, but that his grace was probably the most improper person of them all, to offer this consideration on the behalf of his brethren.

What his grace's moderation was, while he was bishop of Oxford, I leave to be determined by those who were then under his government; what it was when he came to be the head of his order, the following admonition, intended for his brethren in convocation 1761, will sufficiently shew.

SEMPER ENITENDUM EST ut ANTIQUI REGIMINIS non modo retineamus formam, SED ET VIM INSTAUREMUS, quatenus vel DIVINO VEL HUMANO JURE FULCITUR. Atque INTERIM, MANCA quodammodo et MUTILA erit πολιτια nostra.*

That is to say, *we must always* STRIVE, *not only to retain the form, but to* RENEW THE FORCE *of the* ANCIENT CHURCH-GOVERNMENT, *so far as it is* PROPPED UP *either by* DIVINE *or* HUMAN AUTHORITY; *and till that be done, our* POLITY *will be* LAME *and* DEFECTIVE.

Now what was this ancient church-government? Even the model left us by some of his grace's predecessors and their adherents, who never wanted props for it (if you would take their interpretations of scripture) either from divine or human authority. And the force of it consisted, in putting *a two-edged sword into the hands of* church-governors, *to execute ven-*

* *Oratio synodalis*, at the end of his grace's charges, *Page* 360.

*geance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people.** In plain english, power to correct heretics, schismatics, and dissenters, with the wholesome severities of whips, pillories, fines and imprisonment.

Without this force, it seems our present ecclesiastical polity is "mutilated and lame;" and it is, in his grace's opinion, not only right to have this force renewed, but absolutely the duty of the members of the convocation, to strive to have it renewed.

"Is this the same man," may some people say, "who seems in his letter to Mr. Walpole, "to be so well contented with the share of "power enjoyed by the present bishops, and "who would have been satisfied with much "less, if he had lived where much less had "been allotted to bishops? Is this the man "who stands forth to assure the public, that "he and his brethren are not so fond of church "power, as to be aiming at that point now, "while they solemnly profess they are not?" †

For my part, I can see but little room we can make for the virtue of sincerity here. In the letter his grace assures us, with a solemn face and a smooth tongue, that nothing more is required for these american bishops, than commissarial jurisdiction, and authority to confirm and ordain. In the oration, the ancient church government is to be contended for at all events; and without the force of it,

* See Pfalm cxlix. 6, 7. To which archbiſhop *Laud* prefixed this title. *The Prophet exhorteth to praiſe God for his love to the church: and for that power which he hath given to the church, to rule the conſciences of men.*

† Page 8, 9.

the episcopal powers must be "lame and mutilated." Must we not argue thus? This ancient regimen either belongs to the nature of episcopal churches, or it does not. If it does not, his grace is exhorting the convocation to strive for supporting the form, and reinstating the force of an ancient usurpation. If it does, the same pretence which serves for a colour to station bishops in America, will serve for a pretence to claim for them the form and force of the ancient government, namely, the pretence that it belongs to the nature of episcopal churches: and this, I should think, amounts to something more than a possibility, that an improper use may hereafter be attempted to be made of the appointment of bishops for America.

Once more, what shall we say for his grace's sincerity and his moderation? These two publications are coeval, and by the time and manner of their appearance, should seem between them to exhibit his grace's dying sentiments.

But the moderation and sincerity, concerning which, in examining his grace's portions of them, we are left in so much uncertainty, we may perhaps find in his grace's coadjutors in this project, with more precision. It sometimes happens that men not worth sixpence, will offer their bond for great sums, on the behalf of others who are very well able to pay without them.

"Archbishop Tenison," says his grace, "who was surely no high churchman, left "l. 1000 towards the establishment of bishops "in America."*

* Page 9.

His grace, I am afraid, is a little unlucky in his instance: I am in some doubt whether archbishop Tenison's sincerity in this bequest, is altogether consistent with archbishop Secker's in this pamphlet. But let the reader determine.

In archbishop Tenison's will, executed April 11th. 1715, five hundred pounds were bequeathed to the society for propagating the gospel in foreign parts, "for the purchasing "one or more perpetual advowson's donations, "right of patronage and presentation of, in, "and to one or more vicarages or rectories, "and to present thereto from time to time, as "often as the same shall become void, one or "more of the most deserving missionaries of "the province of Canterbury."

But by a codicil, executed Dec. 2, 1715, his grace revokes and declares this bequest null and void, and in the room of it substitutes what follows :—

"But my present will is, that my executors, "their administrators or assigns, do well and "truly pay to the said society, within one "month, or two at the farthest, after the ap-"pointment and consecration by lawful au-"thority of two protestant bishops, one for "the continent, another for the isles in north "America, the sum of one thousand pounds, "to be applied in equal portions to the settle-"ment of such bishops in the fore-mentioned "sees. Until such lawful appointment and "consecrations are compleated, I am very "sensible (as many of my brethren of that "society also are) that as there has not hi-"therto been, notwithstanding much impor-

" tunity and many promises to the contrary,
" so there never will or can be any regular
" church discipline in those parts, or any con-
" firmations or due ordinations, or any setting
" apart in ecclesiastical manner, of any public
" places for the more decent worship of God,
" or any timely preventing or abating of
" factions and divisions, which have been and
" are at present very rife; no ecclesiastically
" legal discipline or corrections of scandalous
" manners, either in the clergy or laity, or
" synodical assemblies, as may be a proper
" means to regulate ecclesiastical proceedings.
" In the mean time, till such appointment and
" consecration as above-said is compleated, my
" will is, that my executors do not pay the
" said thousand pounds, or any part or portion
" of it, or any interest for the whole or any
" part of it to the said society, but as they
" have opportunity, to put out the said sum
" or part of it to interest upon sure public
" funds, and to apply such interest to the
" benefit of such missionaries, being english-
" men, and of the province of Canterbury, as
" they shall find upon good information, to
" have taken true pains in the respective places
" which have been committed by the said
" society to their care, in the said foreign
" plantations, and have been by unavoidable
" accidents, sickness or other infirmities of
" the body, or old age, disabled from the per-
" formance of their duties in the said places
" or precincts, and forced to return to Eng-
" land."

Such is the bequest of archbishop Tenison, in which we may observe a very different plan

of american episcopacy from that delineated by his successor, Dr. Secker, in this letter. We have here the whole hierarchical apparatus of english episcopacy enumerated in the minutest manner. "Regular church discipline. "—Consecration of churches.—Prevention "of factions and divisions:" (meaning, I suppose, provisions for uniformity)—"Due or-"dinations:" (which the colonists are supposed to want, for it seems till a bishop is appointed there *never will be* any such)—"Ecclesiasti-"cally-legal corrections both of the clergy "and laity." And to crown all, "Synodical "assemblies to regulate ecclesiastical proceed-"ings."

From the tenor of this codicil, and particularly from the words, "in the mean time, till "such appointment and consecration as above-"said is compleated," it is clear, that till this system of prelatical jurisdiction is settled in North America, both on the continent and in the isles, the executors of archbishop Tenison, their administrators, or assigns, will not be obliged to pay a single sixpence of the thousand pounds to the propagating society; for that settlement is plainly the consideration for which the legacy is left: consequently, it cannot be applied to the maintenance of bishops with the limited, and no more than commissarial jurisdiction, for which Dr. Secker pleads.

It cannot in the least be doubted, but his late grace of Canterbury was well acquainted with the contents of this codicil, so far as it related to the appointment of american bishops. Why then did he content himself with this general mention of the legacy, and sup-

press the conditions of it? Plainly for two very obvious reasons.

1. Lest Mr. Walpole should suspect his lordship's sincerity in affecting to desire no more power for american bishops, than he seems to plead for in this letter. Mr. Walpole would be certain that Dr. Secker, in case he carried his point for american bishops, would not consent to give up this legacy of archbishop Tenison; and he would naturally conclude, that upon the event of appointing such bishops, Dr. Secker, as a man of sense, and a man of politics, would make the preservation of the legacy, an argument for granting the additional jurisdiction described in the codicil.

2. The particulars enumerated in the codicil, are utterly inconsistent with the character of *no high church-man*, for which he would recommend the example of archbishop Tenison. The exhibition of them would indeed have made a farther discovery, equally unfavourable to the views and principles of many of Dr. Tenison's brethren of the society, who are represented as equally sensible with his grace, that all these ecclesiastical necessaries would follow the appointment of bishops, and could not be had without it; and consequently would quite spoil Dr. Secker's argument drawn from the "universal desire of his brethren, and of "the members of the society, as well laymen "as clergymen, of establishing colony bishops, "from the revolution to this day;" and induce a suspicion that the conversion of the Indians was but a blind, a mere pretence of the

high church-men, to obtain a charter for the nobler purpose of establishing bishops. For his grace expressly tells us, that, "this whole "body of men, almost ever since it was in "being, hath been making repeated applica- "tions for bishops in America."* Behold then the cloven foot which his grace, no doubt, thought was sufficiently covered by this general reference to archbishop Tenison's legacy, as he might be pretty sure Mr. Walpole would hardly go to the commons to consult the original.

I am however persuaded, that there have been, and still are numbers of that respectable society, who fall not under his grace's crude representation. I could, if it was proper, point out some most worthy men, whose names were not long ago upon the list, who thought no better of the episcopising project than Mr. Walpole, and particularly as described in archbishop Tenison's codicil: but the artifice was plausible to bring the whole body into the same predicament, with a man of archbishop Tenison's moderation (for such that worthy prelate really was) at their head.

But if a man of moderation, how shall we account for this scheme of episcopal discipline espoused in this codicil, and on which the good old man lays so much stress? Could he be ignorant that it was the exercise of the same powers from which the original colonists of America fled into the wilderness? On the other hand it may be asked, could this be the same man, who in the year 1689, pleaded for admit-

* Page 9.

ting the dissenting clergy into the church without re-ordination by bishops? Could this be the same man, who had experienced so severely in 1700, how improper synodical assemblies were to regulate ecclesiastical proceedings, or to prevent and abate factions and divisions? *

The truth is, this codicil was executed but twelve days before the archbishop's death, when the powers of judgment and reflection may well be supposed to have been greatly impaired. His grace was then in the eighty-fifth year of his age, worn out with the effects of a severe gout, and other infirmities incident to so late a period of life. He was then also in the hands of two or three reverend doctors, who have since had many opportunities of displaying their attachment to the church in the most eminent stations, and who would not fail to suggest to the expiring prelate, the merit and the glory of contributing to a scheme so beneficial and so honourable to the church of England. That this archbishop was then under some such influence, is highly probable from his mentioning in the codicil, that "many of "his brethren of the propagating society, "were sensible as well as himself of the neces- "sity of settling bishops in America, for the "wise ends there signified;" which naturally refers to some conversation on the subject still fresh in his mind, of which he retained the impressions so long at least as was necessary to answer the purposes of his advisers. But though archbishop Tenison had not remaining

* Memoirs of archbishop Tenison, page 13, 14, and 77—101.

upon his mind "those strong impressions of "the terrors of ecclesiastical influence," so prevalent "at the latter end of queen Anne's, "and the beginning of king George the first's "reign;" yet it seems those impressions still remained with "persons in public stations," which sufficiently accounts for the hints in the codicil, viz. "the much importunity, and the "many [unperformed] promises," of establishing an hierarchical jurisdiction and discipline, in the north american colonies. The ministers, were aware of the characters of the importuners, though the honest, unsuspecting archbishop was not.

In one word, great allowances ought to be made for the failings of so great and so good a man as archbishop Tenison, but nothing can be more invidious, or more injurious to his character, than to hold them up as examples for imitation.

To proceed. His grace would have it believed, that "some people have apprehended, "that the appointment of american bishops "will tend to the depression of the hierarchy, "as it will afford the laity here an example of "english bishops abroad with no other than "spiritual powers; which may tempt them to "think of reducing the bishops at home to the "same condition."*

Had his grace thought proper to inform us who they were that formed such apprehensions, we might possibly have hit upon some method of satisfying them, different from that his grace hath taken; which, it is not unlikely

* Letter to Mr. Walpole. page 10.

Mr. Walpole might consider as a sneer. If these apprehenders were such as my lords the bishops had convinced, that none but what his grace calls "spiritual powers," were to be granted to their american brethren, it would be hard to say what melancholy consequences they might not draw from a contemplation on the hardship and indignity of such a limitation.

But to raise these drooping spirits, his grace very comfortably assures them, that all is safe and snug at home, as heart can wish. "I "should be very willing," says his grace, "for the benefit of those of our communion in "the colonies, to run a greater risque than I "conceive this to be:" and the reason of his grace's security on this head was, it seems, that it is "no longer a secret, that the temporal "powers and privileges of my lords the bi- "shops, are merely concessions from the "state." *

Here one would imagine, these *men of apprehension* might ask, "but the state observ- "ing from the examples of american bishops "that these temporal powers and privileges "might be spared, is there no danger, that it "might take them away?" To this indeed his grace gives no answer, though Mr. Walpole must know he had a very substantial one *in petto;* namely, that though the state might do this, yet as long as the bishops, with these powers and privileges continued to make as harmless and useful a branch of the constitution as many others, they run no risque that the state ever would.

* Page 10.

This was dextrous enough: for had this reason been given, it would have occurred to another sort of apprehenders, that the state might possibly think these temporal powers and privileges as harmless and useful in the hands of american prelates, as they are and have been in the hands of their lordships at home; and in consequence of that notion, would hereafter confer them; an apprehension which might have brought his grace's sincerity a third time in question. And indeed I am so far from thinking this as unlikely to happen as most things, that I cannot but be of opinion, that, had american bishops been appointed about the time this letter was written, his grace would have lived to see this event, and yet have been very able to justify his sincerity by saying, "pray, gentlemen colonists, do not blame me. "I was very sincere in proposing to limit "your bishops to spiritual powers: but who am "I, that you should expect me to control the "policy of the state?" Could Mr. Walpole forbear smiling at the management of his correspondent?

After an uncandid, not to say, unjust comparison of the church and state principles of the inferior, with those of the superior clergy, and telling us, by way of striking the balance, "that there never was a time known when "the upper part of the clergy were so univer-"sally free from wild high church notions," * his grace, very incautiously complains, that

* Witneſs his grace's lectures, charges, and ſynodal oration, and ſome other performances, well known to have been fabricated under his grace's patronage and inſpection.

" the regard which the bulk of the people had " for religion, and the teachers of it, is greatly " diminished, and diminishing daily, to a de- " gree," says his grace, " which I wonder wise " men are not alarmed at." *

It had been well, his grace had mentioned the time when the people had this undiminished regard for religion and the teachers of it, that both the fact and the reasons for it might have been ascertained with precision. The bulk of the people had, at a certain period, a most undiminished regard for Dr. Henry Sacheverel, and the sort of religion which he, and a number of other teachers, took care to inculcate. I would hope his grace did not allude to these times, or to teachers like these. I would suppose these were the times of those wild high church notions, which his grace disclaims for himself and the upper part of his brethren. In what respect then, does the regard of the bulk of the people for religion, and the teachers of it, appear to be diminished, in times subsequent to these?

His grace should by no means have left us in the dark on these heads, lest it should be suspected, either that this diminished regard is owing to some default in the teachers, or that the teachers who complain of it, require more regard than is due to them. But it was more especially necessary his grace should have been more explicit on this article, as in the very next period his grace seems to solicit an increase of political power for the teachers of re-

* Page 12.

ligion, in order to recover this diminished regard from the bulk of the people.

"It is as important," says his grace, "even in "a political view, that they," [the teachers of religion] "should be able to do good, as that "they should not be able to do harm." A circumstance that is plainly recommended to the consideration of those wise men, who, to his grace's surprise, are not alarmed at the present disregard of the teachers of religion.

Now in this political view, the teachers of religion cannot be enabled to do the good required, but by an increase of political power. The spiritual power of preaching the word of God, and of administring with all diligence to the spiritual welfare of their respective flocks, none of the established teachers of religion in this happy country can be supposed either to want, or not to employ under our excellent and unalterable ecclesiastical system. Some people indeed are apt to think that more good might be done in this spiritual way, than is done; and will perhaps be ready to say, let the teachers of religion, from the highest to the lowest, first try what good may be done towards recovering this regard of the people, by the serious and diligent application of their spiritual powers; and if this, upon a fair experiment, should be found to be insufficient, it will then be time enough to move for an increase of their political power.

But what is extremely unfortunate for his grace's argument, the colonists of our communion it seems, are in the same predicament with the bulk of the people in old England.

"Nor do I find," adds his grace, "that "bigotry to the church prevails among the "members of it in our colonies;"* which can only signify, (as that clause falls in with what goes before) that, the regard of the bulk of the church of England colonists for religion, and the teachers of it, is equally diminished among them, as in the mother country.

Will not then an increase of political power be as necessary for these new teachers of religion in America, as for the old ones at home? And must not their limited spiritual powers be as ineffectual for a reformation there, as they have been found to be in England?

"The bishop of London's commissaries," his grace believes, "have gained no acces- "sions to what was granted them originally."† The contrary of which is the truth, as will be seen below. Not to mention, what has been often hinted, that the commissaries have frequently found the means, not only of pretending to, but of exercising powers which never were granted them.

"But the bishops will be more narrowly "watched, by the the governors, by other "sects, by the laity, and even the clergy of "their own communion."‡

But what kind of men must these bishops be, who want so much watching, and that by persons so differently interested in their appointment? If his grace knew that this would be the case, he must have known likewise, that it could only proceed from a jealousy, entertained by the colonists of all ranks and denomina-

* Page 12. † Page 13 ‡ Ibid.

tions, of the natural tendency of this episcopal appointment to encroachment and oppression; and with these sentiments, how could his grace imagine such appointment would stir up no "dangerous uneasinesses?" But indeed when we consider the different circumstances to which this variety of *watching* must be directed, one cannot help supposing that "dangerous uneasinessess" must be the natural consequence of this abundant vigilance.

The governors would watch according to their directions from home, which would probably be, that the bishops (the confidants of the crown) should not suffer from any diminution of the regard that is due to them; the other sects would watch, on the contrary, that this regard should not arise above what they imagine is due to them, which they would fix at a much lower standard than the governors would think reasonable; the laity would watch, that they might not be harassed with ecclesiastical censures; and the clergy would watch to enforce them, and to support the regard due to episcopal power; and in that they would certainly find their account, as the bishops must have the power of rewarding, or at least of recommending the meritorious, as well as censuring delinquents.

However, that the bishops would be more narrowly watched than the commissaries have been, is contrary to all experience. A man would have little chance for redress against the arbitrary acts of a justice of the peace, who could not obtain satisfaction for the insults of a petty constable. One cannot but wonder his

grace should not feel the ridicule to which this childish representation would expose him.

The remainder of his grace's lucubrations in this paragraph, are built upon the same sort of hypothesis; militating partly against matter of fact, and partly against each other, as where he speaks of "governors watching the bishops," who "will nevertheless be such persons as the "crown can best confide in."* Might not his grace as well have said, that the governors would be more narrowly watched by the bishops? And again, "a right of recalling them may be "reserved to the king." Does his grace mean, a right of putting an end to their function? So it should seem as, *ex hypothesi*, this recalling must be on account of their misdemeanours. It is a material question, and I should like to see an answer to it, from some of those to whom his grace has bequeathed his principles on the article of church authority.

His grace having done his endeavour to quiet our apprehensions with respect to an increase of church power among the Americans, by sending them bishops, on mere suppositions and probabilities, proceeds to strengthen his case by referring to actual precedents!

"It ought to be considered further, says his "grace, that an act of the last session of par-"liament (1749) which passed without any op-"position from any body, hath expressly es-"tablished MORAVIAN bishops in America, "who have much higher and stricter notions of "church government and discipline than we "have."†

* Page 13. † Page 14.

Bold and surprizing! His grace ventures no less than the supposition that Mr. Walpole must never have seen the act in question, nor have known any thing of the contents of it.

Can any man of common sense understand less by the words, "expressly established," than that the act gives these moravian bishops a power to exercise their function, assigns them their stations, and secures their stipends?

And yet the case is only this. The Moravians, to whom this act relates, are such as scruple to take an oath, or to serve personally in the army. This law dispenses with them in both these articles, upon condition of their making a solemn affirmation instead of an oath, and paying a sum of money sufficient to hire a substitute to perform military service in their room.

But lest the government should be imposed upon by persons pretending to be of the moravian society who are not, it is enacted, that every one who claims the benefit of this act, shall produce a certificate signed by some bishop of the said church, or by the pastor of such church or congregation who shall be nearest to the place where the claim is made, that he is actually a member of the said church.

And to prevent frauds or forgeries of false certificates, it is farther enacted, that the advocate of the said church, shall lay or cause to be laid before the commissioners for trade and plantations, a list or lists of all the bishops of the said church who are appointed by them to grant certificates as aforesaid, together with their hand-writing and usual seals of any bishops that shall hereafter be consecrated by them, as aforesaid; and the names of such pastors, as shall

be authorised by the said advocate or bishops to give certificates in any of his Majesty's colonies in America.*

Undoubtedly his grace might give what names to what things he pleased, and so might call this an act for establishing moravian bishops in America: but we are not obliged to adopt his grace's ideas. It is not even said that these certifying bishops should be resident in America; and for any thing that appears, they might be such as resided in England, Poland, Prussia, Silesia, &c. in all which, and in other other places, the act says, the moravian church is settled; and these bishops indeed are just as expressly established by this act, in those countries, as in America.

His grace affirms, that this act was passed without any opposition from any body. But, Rimius, the virulent chastiser of the moravians, assures us it was opposed by a certain member, upon a suggestion, that "the moravians in "Germany had made the greatest part of pro-"testants run mad by their devices." When he could not prevail to have the bill thrown out, the same person proposed that they should be restrained from making converts; which was likewise disregarded, for a reason which shall be mentioned by and bye.†

"Why then" says his grace (arguing *a fortiori*) "should there be such fear of establish-"ing bishops of the church of England?"

A question which supposes these Moravian bishops were established with the knowledge

* 22d GEORGE II. cap. 30.

† Preface to the Supplement to the Candid Narrative, page cxvii.

and consent of the colonists; which every one knows could not be the case; and in all probability this act was passed, before the Americans knew any such thing was thought of. And even with respect to our own people at home, bishop Lavington, who knew as much of what passed in parliament as his brother of Oxford, informs us; that "the settlement of "the Moravians in these kingdoms seems to "have been obtained surreptitiously, under "pretence of their being a peaceable innocent "sort of people." But his lordship hoped that "their iniquity and filthiness being laid open "by Mr. Rimius and himself, they would be "compelled to emigrate, as had been found "necessary in other countries."*

Doubtless his grace's argument *a fortiori*, hath great force and propriety, in reference to this precedent.

His grace's expostulation indeed is founded on the the consideration, that "the Moravians "have much higher and stricter notions of "church government and discipline, than we "of the church of England have." Well then, let us consider what sort of bishops these Moravians have among them.

The *Unitas fratrum*, in whose favour the act under consideration was made, are said there, to be members of the church which was formerly settled in Moravia and Bohemia: the remains of which was then settled in Poland. Among these count Zinzendorf was ordained, or if you please, consecrated a bishop at Lissa. But here, "all their ministers were on an equal

* Preface to the Moravians compared, Page xiv.

" footing, the oldest of them, without having " respect to the importance of his cure, is al- " ways chosen a senior or elder for the sake of " ordinations, and is nothing else but *primus* " *inter pares*, having not the least jurisdiction " or authority over the other clergy."* This gives us no very striking idea of the high-church notions of these Moravians with respect to church government and discipline : and would the english bishops designed for America, consent to a reduction of this kind, perhaps the colonists might give the project a farther consideration.

But supposing the moravian bishops to be expressly established in America, and to have all the prelatical powers with which our english bishops are invested, what is the consequence? A very unfortunate one for his grace's project, if Mr. Rimius is to be believed, who when he wanted to exclude the moravian bishops from exercising their function in England, confronted them with a canon of the first Nicene council, which enjoins, that two bishops shall not preside together in the same city. The moravian bishops, according to this doctrine, have a canonical title by pre-occupation, and the english bishops must be excluded of course from America, on the pain of being censured as uncanonical interlopers.

" If for want of these" [english bishops] continues his grace, " the moravian bishops " should ordain such ministers for our people " as they thought proper, or should they, by " administring confirmation, or by the rever-

* Rimius ubi supra, p. xxxii,

"ence of their episcopal character, be conti-
"nually gaining converts from us, it would
"be a very undesirable thing on many ac-
"counts, particularly on this, that most of
"them refuse taking oaths, and bearing arms."

Had I been of counsel with the publishers of this letter, I should certainly have advised them to have suppressed this passage, unless they could have added a note to shew that these conversions had actually been made by the moravians in alarming numbers, and that undesirable consequences had proceeded from them. As matters now turn out, this idle scarecrow is consigned to contempt and ridicule by the experience of twenty years, during which no such events have been heard of.

But this is not the worst. His grace, by this unwary auguration is exposed to a very obvious reflection, namely, that "a power of "ordaining and confirming, together with the "reverence of the episcopal character, are very "likely means of continually gaining prose-"lytes." And what was undesirable with respect to these moravian bishops in his grace's account, we may be sure would be undesireable in the account of the non-conforming colonists, with respect to bishops of the church of England. They will therefore consider this insinuation as the effect of his grace's inadvertently dropping the mask, and as exhibiting a full view of his expectations from the establishment of bishops in America.

But after all, on what accounts would these conversions be undesirable? One would have expected from an english prelate to have had one of these accounts at least specified, as af-

fecting the religion of the converts, viz. the undesireableness of having our people converted from a better religion to a worse. But then, what must have been said for archbishop Potter, who, in a complimentary letter to count Zindendorf, so highly extols the orthodoxy of the moravian church; "acknowledging its "full agreement with the church of England, "both in the purity of the primitive faith, and "in the defence of the primitive discipline?" And if Dr. Potter was sincere in this, we may be very sure that how high and strict soever the notions of the Moravians may be concerning church government and discipline, they are neither higher nor stricter than the notions of the church of England on those subjects, if a learned and orthodox archbishop of Canterbury may determine for her.*

It was mentioned above, that when the act in favour of the Moravians was under the consideration of parliament, a certain member who opposed it, not being able to prevail to have it thrown out, proposed to have them restrained from making converts. This was likewise rejected. "The majority" says Rimius, "taking these people for the ancient Moravian "church:"—which affords another reason why his grace (to whom this transaction could hardly be unknown) would not mention the conversions made by the Moravians as undesireable on a religious account, as the parliament had seemed to determine, that the religious principles of the Americans would not

* Biographia Britannica, vol. vii. Art. Zinzendorf, Rem. [G.]

be hurt by their being converted to the moravian system.

His grace's political reason for standing in awe of these conversions, would, I suppose, be less considerable with Mr. Walpole, as nothing undesireable, of this sort at least, had arose from the pensylvanian quakers, who profess the same principles with these Moravians.

The nonjuring jacobite bishops in our colonies, we may well suppose to be mere nonentities, as his grace himself is so very doubtful about them.

"But popish bishops also," his grace apprehends, "have recourse to the colonies from "time to time. At least," says his grace, "the bishop of Quebec hath no small influ- "ence in a very important new settlement of "ours."*

A shrewd writer in the London chronicle of August 22, seems disposed to believe, from the mention here made of this new settlement, that this letter to Mr. Walpole is certainly spurious, as this settlement was not ours till eight years after the date of it. To which might be added, that from the time this settlement became ours, till after the peace of Fontainbleau, there was no popish bishop at Quebec. Nor indeed could this clause be penned, unless by the spirit of prophecy, till the year 1764, when the present popish bishop of Quebec, embarked in England for his new diocese, where he could have no personal influence, great or small, before his arrival.

But instead of relying upon this as a proof

* Letter, page 156

that this letter is spurious, I am inclined to think it more probable, that his grace thought proper to re-touch this favourite rescript from time to time; retrenching possibly some topics he had made use of in his answer to Dr. Mayhew's observations, and adding others, as new incidents arose relative to his subject. Of this there are, if I mistake not, evident traces in other parts of this letter, though none perhaps which afford so manifest indications of "a "mind sympathizing with bodily infirmities."

For might not his grace have been asked, how came this bishop of Quebec by his no small influence? How came he there at all? Was not the establishment of a popish bishop in an important new settlement under his Majesty's government, a matter worthy of the interposition of a protestant archbishop? Was not his grace then at the head of the church of England? And was it ever heard that his grace remonstrated either in public or private, against a measure so seemingly inconsistent with the interests and honour of the church of England, and even with the safety of our protestant government?

This is not the first time I have heard these questions asked; and I wish I could say I had ever heard a more satisfactory answer to them, than that the profound silence observed on that occasion, was with a view to obtain a precedent for settling church of England bishops in America.

But whatever might be the reason of his grace's acquiescence at that period, certain it is that the toleration of a popish bishop at

Quebec, has been brought as an argument for establishing protestant bishops in the colonies, in certain discourses delivered before a certain society, where his grace presided; and in this very pamphlet his grace was not ashamed to plead the example of popish bishops at home, who, he tells us, "perform the same religious "acts by connivance, which he proposes his "american bishops should be empowered to do "by authority."*

Can these precedents be decently pleaded by the fathers of the church of England for establishing protestant bishops in America, but upon the supposition that the toleration of popish bishops is absolutely void of danger, both here and in America? And yet, to serve the same turn another way, his grace most inconsistently supposes the danger from the influence of the bishop of Quebec to be great, and still greater from the neglect of not having bishops of our own in that country to counteract this influence; which however, is an hypothesis contrary to a known fact. For to what can this counteraction amount in the colonies where a popish bishop is permitted by more than connivance, when, as we learn from his grace on another occasion, "popish bishops "reside here, and perform every part of their "function without offence and without observa-"tion,"† in spite of the vigilance of twenty-six prelates of the established church, and the terror of strict laws, wisely provided by our protestant ancestors against the pernicious ef-

* Ibid, page 19.
† Anſwer to Dr. Mayhew's obſervations, page 66.

fects of the intolerant spirit and destructive principles of these very bishops.

We are now arrived at the third question, *viz.* "Whether such an appointment, however "harmless and useful it might be otherwise, "would not stir up dangerous uneasinesses, "abroad or at home? And here," says his grace, "it is asked, If the members of our "church in America, would like to have bis-"hops among them, why they never petitioned "for them?"*

This question, without all doubt, came from Mr. Walpole, and therefore we may safely take it for granted, that no petition for bishops had ever been offered on the part of these church of England colonists. It will be necessary to give his grace's answer to it in his own words.

"Surely their omitting it may well be as-"cribed in part, to the thoughtlessness of "mankind about their religious concerns, "which hath been so peculiarly great in those "countries, that some of them did not peti-"tion for help, when they had no one office "of christianity administered among them."†

Turn over the leaf, and there you will find it, thus written; "Indeed of course it should "be presumed, and none but the very strongest "evidence admitted to the contrary, that all "persons desire to have within their reach, "the means of exercising their religion com-"pletely.‡

What is now to be done to reconcile the fact to the presumption? We are to presume, that all persons desire, what the the thoughtlessness

* Letter, page 15. † Ibid. ‡ Page 16.

of mankind, and strong evidence from a most remarkable case to confirm it, plainly shew that all persons do nót desire.

Take the matter of fact, and you find the church of England colonists in so abandoned a state of negligence and indolence about their religious concerns, that there is not the least probability that a whole bench of bishops would recall them to due attention. For it appears by the sequel, that missionaries have been sent them unpetioned for, without the least good effect. They continue as thoughtless about their religious concerns as ever, as appears from their not petitioning to have the complete exercise of their religion within their reach.

Take the presumption, and you must conclude they are persuaded that they already have within their reach the means of exercising their religion completely without bishops; and that his grace was only inventing reasons for their not petitioning suitable to his own ideas.

I shall not inquire into the matter of fact, namely, how far any part of the colonies, was ever without the administration of any one office of christianity among them: I have been told, it is not true; but be that as it may, I have his grace's own testimony before me, given when he was bishop of Oxford, that they who were in the most deplorable circumstances of this sort were not slack in petitioning for relief.

"In these circumstances," said the bishop of Oxford, "the poor inhabitants made from "ALL PARTS the most affecting representa-"tions of their deplorable condition, the truth

" of which was but too fully confirmed by their " respective governors, and the persons of " principal note among them."* In this variety of his graces's accounts, what are we to believe?

Another reason why these colonists did not petition, is, that " probably too many of " their clergy think, they may both live more " negligently, and have a better chance for " preferment now, than if a bishop were to in- " spect them, and ordain natives to be their " rivals."*

This may be a reason why these negligent, aspiring, envious clergymen, should not petition, but is rather a reason why the laity should, especially if " they desire to have " within their reach, the means of exercising " their religion completely;" for this they can no more have under negligent pastors, than they can have it without bishops:- but indeed, if the lay-colonists took their measures from experience and history, they would hardly think the negligence or ambition of their pastors were likely to be cured by petitioning for bishops. It is hardly to be supposed but these colonists must have some conception how matters have stood in the mother country in former times, as well as in the present. They

* See the bishop of Oxford's sermon, before the society for the *Propagation*, &c. Feb. 1740—41. page 5. second edition, octavo. It is certain that *all parts* of our American colonies, were never in this deplorable condition, and that any representations of that sort must be false, unless, by a mean and disreputable equivocation, the preacher meant, that the offices administered by the non-conformist pastors, are not offices of christianity. Consult Dr. Mayhew's observations on the charter and conduct, &c. chapters v. and vi.

* Letter, page 15.

must be aware, that there have been times, at no great distance from the migration of their ancestors to America, when the bishops of England were deprived of their power. The present age, wherein the bishops of the mother country enjoy their power under the protection of the state and the law, they have before them in full contemplation; and they may if they please, compare the diligence, humility, and simplicity of common pastors and ministers of the church at these different periods. They will at least perceive, that there were more temptations to negligence and ambition in the one situation, than in the other. Commendams, dispensations for pluralities, and sinecures, (the parents of non-residence, and the lures of ecclesiastical ambition) are appendages to episcopal churches, and, as some people imagine, substantial obstructions to christian edification. There is a chance at least that religion would be upon a better footing where the clergy have not these indulgences to look for: and they who are negligent and ambitious without them, would hardly be more diligent or less aspiring when they are thrown in their way.

At length his grace suggests a third reason to Mr. Walpole why these colonists did not petition for bishops, which is, that "the inhabitants of the colonies, living at such a distance, and not knowing when an application to the government might be seasonable; and being assured, that the bishops here, especially the bishop of London, and the society for propagating the gospel, would always be attentive to this point, have left it to them.

"And they to whom it is thus left, have re-
"ceived abundant proofs, that very great
"numbers of the laity of the church of Eng-
"land, in those countries, of higher as well
"as lower rank, earnestly desire to have bi-
"shops settled there, and think it would be a
"most valuable public benefit."*

But how comes it that Mr. Walpole, a minister of state, should never know of all this? How comes it, that the bishops and the society to whom this matter was left, with so full confidence, that they would always be attentive to it, never either petitioned the government themselves on behalf of those who put this confidence in them, or apprised the government of the earnest desires of these colonists to have bishops settled among them?

Whatever his grace might do, I am persuaded Mr. Walpole did not quibble upon the word, petition; but assuredly meant that it never appeared to the government, that the colonists had any such *earnest desires* to have a bishop among them: and that whatever had been laid before the government by the bishops and the society, of this sort, had fallen short of the proof that was required.

The real truth, I believe, is, that the missionaries have been from time to time instructed to use their endeavours to procure such petitions from the colonists, in which some of them have not been remiss, as appears sufficiently by Dr. Bradbury Chandler's pamphlets; but, as it should seem, without any effect, except perhaps, some intimations from their governors and counsellors who are appointed in the mother country. Every one knows, that his

* Letter, page 16.

grace, after his accession to the see of Canterbury, was particularly assiduous in promoting an episcopal establishment in America; in which pious project, Mr. Apthorp and the said Dr. Chandler seem to have been his most considerable instruments: and as no body ever heard of these *earnest desires* of the colonists to give into this scheme so early as the year 1750, before the notice given us in this letter, it is probable his grace might have been privately at work on this project, from the moment he was invested with the lawn. Whether he had any coadjutors, after the demise of bishop Gibson, (from whom most probably he derived his *entetement* for this measure) I cannot say; but from that period the bishop of Oxford was undoubtedly the master workman, and knew more of the pains that had been taken at home and abroad to carry the point of petitioning, than any of his brethren. But unfortunately Mr. Walpole happened to know as much as the bishop of Oxford; who, for want of the "abundant proof" that Mr. Walpole had reason to demand, is obliged to fly to the miserable expedient of presuming upon, what he had himself before shewn to be contrary to the matter of fact.

But though this affair of petitioning could not be brought about, yet his grace informs us, that "the bishops and the society, to "whom this matter was left, had found no "cause to imagine that any opposition would "be made to it from that quarter.* This is cautiously enough worded, and perhaps implies no more, than that it was more reasonable

* Page 16.

for them to believe the accounts transmitted to them by their own Missionaries, than those which came from any other quarter.

"It is true," says his grace, "some of them "have provided against enlarging the juris- "diction of the commissaries; but none of "them have expressed any public reluctance "to the appointment of bishops."*

"Some of them," i. e. of the lay colonists of the church of England: but these, whoever they were, could not thus provide without some public act of the whole body, or of the whole representative. Whence I suppose the government would easily conceive with what reluctance they would listen to the appointment of a superior power, when they had been so careful to provide against the oppression of an inferior.†

* Page 17.

† How they were disposed towards the appointment of bishops, about this time, may be understood from the following anecdote. In May, 1749, Eliakim Palmer, Esq. introduced Mr. Hooper, (one of the council of Barbadoes, possessed of a considerable plantation there) to the bishop of London [Dr. Sherlock.] Mr. Hooper, on that occasion, told his lordship, that "he and all their people dis- "liked the project." He informed his lordship likewise, that his lordship's commissary there, requested an act to impower him to suspend such clergymen as were infamous in their lives. One clergyman of unexceptionable character, opposed it, and so the power was granted for three years only. One of the first acts of this commissary was, to ensnare this good man. At a public meeting they put an ingredient into his punch, to make him drunk: so soon as he found himself not well, he quitted the place, and went homeward; his way was through a long narrow passage: there they placed a common whore, who, as instructed, clung about him, with other indecencies: the good man however shook her off, and went directly home. They had placed two men about this narrow passage to observe what passed. The next day he received a summons to appear before the commissary, to a charge of being drunk and picking up a whore, and taking her into that passage to gratify his lust: the two

If the colonists expressed no "public reluctance" to the appointment of bishops among

men witneſſed againſt him, and the commiſſary ſuſpended him. The whole pariſh were diſſatisfied, and applied to the commiſſary to take off the ſuſpenſion, but he refuſed. They then applied to the governor and council to uſe their intereſt with the commiſſary, that he might be reſtored to them: they did ſo, but to no purpoſe. The people, nettled at this refuſal, demanded a libel againſt another clergyman of an infamous and profligate character. The charge was proved, but the commiſſary did not exerciſe his power; for this latter was at the head of thoſe who requeſted the court to grant the power. When Mr. Hooper had told this ſtory to the biſhop, he added, "And now, my lord, will you ſend a biſhop to us, who will have "this, and greater powers?" His lordſhip anſwered, *it is not I that ſend biſhops to America, it is the ſociety for propagating the goſpel in foreign parts, who are the movers of this matter.* Mr. Hooper replied, "I do not care who are the movers, but this I can "with confidence aſſure your lordſhip, that if ever a biſhop ſets foot "on our iſland, the people will toſs him into the ſea." This ſo affected the biſhop, that he told thoſe concerned, they had beſt drop the deſign of ſending a biſhop to the ſugar iſlands, for theſe people were too hot to be dealt with, and ſtick only to the other part of the propoſal, viz. to ſend one to the continent. In conſequence, letters were written to Virginia, to get letters from thence, requeſting a biſhop might be ſent there: but a gentleman concerned for that colony in England, being aware of this ſecret negotiation, immediately wrote to one of the principal gentlemen of the council there; by which means the project was diſappointed for that time. It will, I ſuppoſe, hardly be doubted that the biſhop of Oxford was at that time one of thoſe concerned in this epiſcopizing ſcheme; and yet, he cannot be ſuppoſed, to have written this letter under a conſciouſneſs of theſe facts, without the utmoſt diſingenuity: not to mention, that he could not ſuppoſe but Mr. Walpole muſt know enough of theſe proceedings to be able to contradict him. And therefore to ſave Dr. Secker the reputation of his ſincerity, we muſt conclude, that my lord of London did not chooſe to communicate to him the particulars of the intelligence he received from Mr. Hooper, or to make him privy to his lordſhip's correſpondence with Mr. Walpole. We ſee, biſhop Sherlock diſclaimed having any particular ſhare in ſending biſhops to America, and lays the project to the account of the propagating ſociety, where no doubt he had obſerved the biſhop of Oxford's headlong zeal for accompliſhing this meaſure at all events; and being a man of infinitely more prudence,

them, it was a testimony of their good sense and prudent caution, as no public attempt had been made towards such an appointment. His grace indeed says, that, "for above forty years 'past, the inhabitants there must have had "frequent notices, by various ways, that such "a design was in agitation." p. 17. Possibly they had; but these were notices only of secret cabals and intrigues of particular persons, and perhaps some private application to men in power. But while the design was kept private, and confided to a trusty junto, the rest were at liberty to deny it, and then, what would the colonists have got by their "public reluctance?" Even the honour of being laughed at for trusting to uncertain rumours, and fighting with a shadow?

His grace next proceeds to quiet the apprehensions of those who might be made uneasy by the consideration of the expence required to maintain these colony bishops, and tells us, "it is not intended to burden the crown or "the subject with it." p. 17.

As if the gifts and contributions, mentioned

as well as abilities, than Dr. Secker, he determined to have no more to do with him in this affair, than was unavoidable, as a member of the propagating society. The editors probably thought it might be giving some consequence to his grace, to represent him in the advertisement, as going hand in hand with bishop Sherlock in this episcopizing project, and might hope that the inconsistency of this representation with what his grace hath recorded in the first page of his letter, would be overlooked by his grace's friends and admirers. But have they not rather given occasion to suspect by this piece of art, that his grace had no more consequence with Mr. Walpole, than with bishop Sherlock! And that however his grace came by a sight of that gentleman's letter to bishop Sherlock, his pretended answer to it was never out of the confines of his study till the memorable year 1769!

just after by his grace, would be no burden upon the subject! Some families must want what is thus given and contributed, for what they will think, perhaps, more necessary uses. How often have we had briefs for the purpose of supporting the society's unmitred missionaries? And would his grace have insured us, that none of these would be circulated for the nobler purpose of supporting the dignity of bishops? And are these no burden to the subject?

But where was his grace's memory, where was the modesty of the editors of this letter, who could let such a declaration pass, after Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler had been at the pains to calculate how inconsiderable a tax upon the Americans would be, to maintain a requisite number of American bishops? And how scurvily does this Dr. come off, (when pressed upon this head by Dr. Chauncey) with a silly quibbling distinctiou between, "what "it would be equitable to pay," and "what "no man, if he denied to pay, would deserve "to be considered in the light of a good subject "or member of society."*

* *The Appeal defended, or, the propoſed American epiſcopate vindicated, in anſwer to the objections and miſrepreſentatious of Dr. Chauncey and others. By* THOMAS BRADBURY CHANDLER. D. D. New York, printed by Hugh Gaine, at the Bible and Crown, in Hanover Square, 1769. p. 249, 250. Whoever will be at the pains to compare this defence with Dr. Secker's letter to Mr. Walpole, will very ſeriouſly lament Dr. Chandler's misfortune in being ſtationed three thouſand miles from HIS biſhop, by whoſe inſtructions the appeal was written, and for whoſe honour it was to be be defended. He might otherwiſe have avoided the mortification of ſeeing his high pretenſions to the rights and privileges of the American epiſcopate, ſo remarkably contraſted with his grace's humble conceſſions, in an hour of deſpondency.

His grace, after acknowledging that the presbyterians and independents of new England, have signified their dislike of his project of late, condescends to say, that, "there never was "any thought of placing them there." p. 18.

How does this agree with bishop Sherlock's exhortation, "to stick to the proposal of send-"ing a bishop to the continent?" But whatever his grace's thoughts might be in 1750, it is certain that new England, after his promotion to Canterbury, was the principal object of his grace's cares for episcopal reformation in America. However, so tender was he of giving these people offence at the time he was writing to Mr. Walpole, that his grace is pleased to allow, that "if they should object against "bishops coming occasionally to officiate "amongst those of the episcopal persuasion "in that province,—that might be omitted."

Now it is well known, that the society's missionaries in New England have always been more, in a double portion at least, than in the other provinces in America. In the year 1761, about thirty missionaries were stationed in New England, while in New York, New Jersey, Pensylvania, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, the Bahama Islands, and Barbadoes, there were no more than forty-nine, according to the society's abstracts.*

If then, notwithstanding the reasonableness of the proposal in the abstract, notwithstanding what belongs to the nature of episcopal churches, and the indispensable necessity of confirmation to the complete exercise of their

* Mayhew's obfervations, page 45. London edition.

religion; notwithstanding the necessity of overlooking the conduct of vagabond strangers, so indifferently qualified, as his grace represents many of them to be:—If, I say, notwithstanding all these considerations, the personal ministrations of a bishop in New England, where there are thirty episcopal churches, may be omitted, it seems scarce worth the while to send bishops, with the expensive appointments, suitable to the dignity of their character, to preside over forty-nine missionaries dispersed in eight extensive provinces, where even the single ceremony of confirmation, to be completely exercised, could hardly be performed by the labours of ten or a dozen bishops, if the uninstructed negroes are to be taken into the account.

After all, his grace seems to be conscious, that the true questions would come to this, whether dangerous uneasinesses would not be stirred up in the colonies, by the appointment of bishops? And whether the colonists would not have sufficient grounds for their uneasinesses, from their experience of the incroaching nature of episcopacy?

In answer to this latter question, his grace thinks fit to say, that the colonists, "cannot "fail to know how much the episcopal power "exercised heretofore by bishops, hath long "since been lessened, and the inclinations "and principles of those who are intrusted "with it, altered for the better."* This hath been considered before, and we need only refer for an answer to it, to the passage quoted above

* Page 18.

from his grace's *Oratio synodalis.* Let us add however, as this matter is once more come upon the carpet, that what his grace ascribes to the better inclinations and principles of himself and his contemporary brethren, is considered by other staunch churchmen, as an unhappy relaxation of that ancient discipline, which the church wishes, in one of her offices, to have restored. Of this complexion is the zealous Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, whom every one now understands to speak the real, undisguised sense of Dr. Secker, both in the appeal, and in his defence of it.

"The want of primitive discipline in the "church at home," saith this diligent missionary, "is no proof that the want of it is not "still greater in the colonies, nor that the "want cannot in some degree, be remedied "by the proposed episcopate. We think that "a strict discipline, with regard to the ame-"rican clergy, might be exercised under an "episcopate. *This is certainly expected.* IT "IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR PLAN; and "that american bishops would disappoint us "in this respect, none have a right to declare, "until the experiment shall have been made."*

Why no indeed, worthy doctor, I dare say the colonists have no such suspicion; and therefore, I presume, it is, that they are so unwilling, and with great reason, to have the experiment made. How little was this strenuous champion aware, while he was writing this, that some of his fellow pupils at home were

* Appeal defended, page 103.

convincing the world, that there was a time, when their common patron had denied every word of it; and that in spite of his *oratio synodalis*, this denial was agreeable to his dying sentiments! After this, trust, ye colonists, if you can, to the sincerity of those who solicit an american episcopate. None of you can be at a loss to know what a high-flying episcopalian means by "primitive discipline," while the history of the settlement of your ancestors in America remains. None of you can be ignorant, that the jurisdiction required to carry this "primitive discipline" into execution, must be as different from the plan delineated in this letter, as your own plan is from that of archbishop Laud. For while his grace is assuring you, that, "no more authority is de-"sired for american bishops, than the dissent-"ing ministers exercise here by law, or popish "priests and bishops by connivance," Dr. Chandler, whose instructions are of a later date, betrays his own and his party's expectations, that "a strict primitive discipline, with "respect to the american clergy," without distinction, may be exercised under this new episcopate.

Attending his grace, to page 19, we find something like an apology for the propagating society's sending letters into America. One would wish to know, what circumstance of Mr. Walpole's letter, gave occasion to it. Making due allowances for his grace's palliations and glosses, the case seems to have been this. The zealous promotors of american episcopacy in the society, finding that the want of petitions from the colonies was a considerable

obstruction to the project, sent letters privately to their confidants to procure such testimonies, (viz. that the colonists approved the measure) as might be a balance at least against the assurances the government had received, that they were averse to it. The practice came to be detected, and the alarm being taken by the friends of religious liberty, the too probable consequences of it were remonstrated to the government. This brought some blame upon the contrivers of this secret correspondence, which his grace sought here to ward off, as well as he could; modestly requesting in the end, that the government would permit them to play out their game, before they rejected the proposal.

His grace's next endeavour is to take off Mr. Walpole's apprehensions, that the attempt, and much more the execution of such a project, "would raise animosities at home, produce "declamations in pulpits, controversies in "pamphlets, debates in parliament, revive the "distinctions of high and low among church-"men, and terrify and provoke the dissen-"ters."*

What his grace says on the part of the pulpit, shall be considered by and bye: and as for the press, he reminds Mr. Walpole, that, "most "virulent pamphlets, published daily both "against church and state, gave the govern-"ment no terror at all."† Not so much indeed, I dare say, as his grace thought they should have given, judging herein by his own

* Page 20. † Page 21.

feelings; no man perhaps, of his station, having ever been more terrified and disquieted by pamphlets and letters in news-papers on church matters, than the late Dr. Secker. Of the fact however, or of its effects, he was far from being so competent a judge as Mr. Walpole, who was very sensible, that it would not follow, because the ministry were not affected by false and invidious charges from the press, respecting their political conduct in mere state affairs, that they would be equally unaffected, when so severe a stroke upon the religious liberties of the colonies, as the executing the episcopizing scheme would be, should be objected to them.

But if Mr. Walpole saw his grace's weakness in this reflection, much more would he be scandalized when, to take off all his apprehensions of what might happen in parliament, he found his grace intimating, that "there seemed "no necessity that this affair should ever come "into parliament."*

By this circumstance, the statesman would discover the man and his communication, and whence he derived his principles. He would recollect too, that parliament had more than once taken a retrospect of ministerial measures, adopted without its sanction; and would never be more likely to do it, than when such measures seemed to tend to raise feuds and animosities, disgust and discontent, in places where the commercial interests of Great Britain are so much concerned, as in the colonies: and if, in the progress of their inquiries, it should

* Page 21.

appear, that the administration had been pressed into this service by the importunity of the bishops in general (who have all been, according to his grace, equally desirous of establishing episcopacy in the colonies, from the revolution, to the date of his letter) few would wonder, if it should be resolved, that "episcopal power "is a great grievance to this nation, and that "it must rise to an equal height wherever "bishops are."

His grace, however, could put Mr. Walpole in the way of composing these stirs even in parliament. "The administration," says his grace, "will easily quiet such of the members "as are their friends;" namely, by threatening to take away their places or their pensions, or by promising them to such of their friends as had them not. "The tories must be for bi-"shops, if it be only to preserve their own "credit:" and consequently, for bishops invested with all the powers which tory principles ascribe as appendages to the office; for it would be impossible to keep their credit with their party, by consenting to the sending out bishops with that limited, low-church jurisdiction, which his grace affects only to desire. "And "the remainder will probably find themselves "too inconsiderable to stir." *The remainder;* that is to say, all the faithful representatives of the people, who are neither to be corrupted by the administration, nor infected by those pernicious principles of religion and government, which have been in times past so pernicious to the rights and liberties of the british subject, and so dangerous to that illustrious succession of protestant princes, under whose government

only we can hope to enjoy them. Excellent patriot! excellent arch-pastor of a free protestant people! who for the sake of magnifying a mere ecclesiastical office, no way essential to the faith or practice of evangelical christianity, would stifle the influence, on which the preservation of the religion and liberties of his country chiefly depends!

It remains to consider "the only danger," which, according to his grace, "is left, viz. "that of alarming or provoking the body of "the dissenters:"* whom he distinguishes into, "a few busy, warm men;" and such as, "after arguing properly with them, have "owned that they had little or nothing to ob- "ject against appointing bishops in plantations "of the episcopal communion."† And among the latter he names Dr. Avery, and Dr. Samuel Chandler.

What Dr. Chandler might say to Dr. Secker, is of little consequence: It can hardly be said, that Dr. Chandler spoke the sense of the body of the dissenters, when it is so well known, that his connexion with that prelate was far from adding to his estimation among them. He is not at present at hand to answer for himself. Possibly somebody might be found, who is able to answer for him. Be that as it may, I shall not presume either to accuse him, or to apologize for him.

Dr. Avery's justification is upon a less precarious footing. It is well known to some yet living, that he was a principal mover of the application to the ministry, about the time this

* Page 22. † Ibid.

letter of Dr. Secker's was written, to lay aside the project of sending bishops to America. If I am not misinformed, he had the honour of conferring with some of his Majesty's ministers on the subject, and gave them unanswerable reasons, why a scheme so likely to produce disturbances in the colonies, should be laid aside. What he is here represented to have acknowledged to the archbishop, is in the highest degree improbable. He was not a man to be overawed by the solemnity or cajoled by the affected civility of an archbishop. He was liberal in his sentiments, and generously open and unreserved in expressing them upon all proper occasions. His conduct, in all his transactions, was inflexibly upright, and far exalted above all narrow, selfish, and sinister views. No man knew all this better than the late archbishop Secker; and if this letter is not spurious, it is not an impossible supposition, that one motive of its sleeping so long in his grace's closet, might be, the danger of having it cross-examined and confronted by the testimony of so respectable a character.

Speaking of the opposition to this episcopizing project, which might be apprehended from the body of dissenters, his grace delivers himself as follows.

"And indeed there is no modesty in saying, "we, who are not of the established church, "demand as a matter of strict justice, the full "exercise of our religion here, but at the same "time insist that the king's episcopal subjects "in America, with whom we have nothing at "all to do, shall not, even in those provinces

" where they are the established church, have " the full exercise of theirs."*

It is pleasant enough to hear his grace talk of " modesty," while he is giving such a representation as this. What would his grace have thought of his having the full exercise of his religion, in case he had not been permitted to enjoy the preferments he once held *in commendam*, without first receiving the communion amongst the dissenters? It is made a part of his merit in the *Biographia Brittannica* that he never did communicate with them, even while he appeared to belong to their church;† whence it may easily be conjectured, how unpalatable such a condition would have been to him when he was bishop of Oxford. Would not his lordship have thought that his Majesty's subjects in America, while not burdened with any such test, would have had a fuller exercise of their religion, than his lordship, even without the ceremony of confirmation? Can a man be said to have the full exercise of his religion, who is excluded from the natural and equitable rights of a good subject, unless he will conform to a mode of religious worship which he thinks to be wrong, and which some of his brethren have thought to be even idolatrous!

It is plain, his grace never made this case of the dissenters his own, and that he gave Mr. Walpole only a copy of his countenance, when he told him, a little below, that, " he should " have been a most hearty and zealous advo- " cate for the dissenters," in a case where they

* Page 23. † Article Butler (Joseph).

happened not to want his assistance, and that, "from his love of religious liberty;"* when he never moved a finger to relieve them in a case where, if he knew what religious liberty meant, he must have known how justly they think they have it not, and where an advocate of his grace's station and character would have been of the greatest service.

There are in this short period, no less than two other misrepresentations. For, 1. His grace could not produce any legal authority for saying, that the episcopal church of England, is the established church, in any of the american provinces. 2. The king's episcopal subjects in America, were not those, with whom our domestic dissenters, had to do in this case. It was their concern for, and their desire to preserve to the Americans of their own anti-episcopal persuasion, the full exercise of their civil and religious rights, (which they apprehended upon good grounds, might be encroached upon, by the admission of bishops into any of the american provinces) that occasioned their vigilance at the time referred to. They knew the hardship of those legal disabilities under which they themselves lay at home. They had good reason to believe that the influence of the established hierarchy contributed to continue this grievance. Their brethren in America were as yet free from it, and if bishops were let in among them, and particularly, under the notion of presiding in established episcopal churches, there was the highest probability, they would take their prece-

* Page 23.

dents of government and discipline from the establishment in the mother country, and would probably never be at rest, till they had established it on the basis of an exclusive test. They knew their american brethren thought on this subject, just as they themselves did. They knew how cautiously the projectors of the plan covered their march from all in the colonies, but their own confidants. They knew that, without their interposition, the arrival of a bishop in America would probably be the first notice the colonists would have of his appointment at home. They were aware of the alarm this would give them, and of the disagreeable consequences of their opposition, with respect to the government. They wisely therefore, and like good patriots, signified their apprehensions to the government, and strengthened them with such proofs, as entirely convinced the ministry, how much the public peace and welfare depended upon the suppression of this pernicious project.

In this transaction I have good grounds to say, that Dr. Avery was a principal actor and adviser; and would his grace have ventured, in his life-time, to rank the Dr. among, "the "few busy, warm men, who only affected to "speak in the name of the whole?" or among those who opposed the episcopizing scheme through, "a wantonness of spirit, or an osten- "tatious fondness of using their influence "with great persons, to grieve the good bi- "shop of Oxford and his partizans, without "serving themselves?"*

* Page 24.

What must their colony-brethren have thought of the dissenters at home, had the latter suffered them to be taken by surprize, and a measure forced upon them, to which, if they had not lost all memory of the first migration of their ancestors from old England, they must have the utmost aversion? What must every disinterested englishman have thought of them, if, possessed as they were of the sense of the colonies, they should, out of a punctilio of complaisance to a few such "busy, warm" men as the B—p of O——d, have quietly suffered a religious war to be kindled in the bowels of America, between the non-episcopalians and the members of the church of England, when they had it in their power to prevent it?

But I shall venture to go still farther. Many of the colonists of the church of England are the descendants of some of the first settlers, who professed church principles, and practised the modes of worship established in old England, in their own houses, when they could not have a minister to officiate among them. Yet these were driven from their native land, by episcopal discipline, merely because they could not conform in every thing. They left however, their principles and practices to their posterity, some of whom, to this hour, attend the ministry of the episcopal missionaries. But as their fathers left them likewise memorials of their own particular sufferings from bishops, they are no more in love with american episcopacy than their ancestors were with english prelacy. To some of these, the idea of a bishop upon the spot, was as disgusting as to the nonconformists themselves; and it is now well

known, that when they were solicited to join some others in representing to the society how much bishops were wanted in the colonies, their answer was, "that they were well satisfied "with the means they had of worshipping God "according to the liturgy, nor did they de- "sire any thing more."

Among other uneasinesses apprehended by Mr. Walpole, as the probable effect of appointing american bishops, one was, "that such a "measure would produce declamations in pul- "pits; and revive the distinction of high and "low among churchmen."*

To this anxiety, his grace administers the following soporific. "Now amongst the clergy, "gy, I conceive it can make no dispute, for "every man of character among them doth, "and must wish it success." His grace should have added, "and every man amongst them "who wishes it success, is and must be a man "of character;" and then the result must have been, that every one who did not wish the project to succeed, was a reprobate, a man of *no* character.

But might not Mr. Walpole have suggested that disputes were most likely to be raised by men of no character? His grace was free enough to confess, that, "if the project were "brought upon the carpet, and the administra- "tion were to oppose it, some clergymen "(some of these men of character) might be "tempted to say indecent things of them:" and I pray, how much less scrupulous may we suppose men of no character, who should not

* Page 20.

wish the project success, would have been, in case the administration had espoused it? Either way then we see declamations from the pulpit, and disputes between clergymen of character, and clergymen of no character, would have been unavoidable, had the affair come upon the carpet. The best way therefore, Mr. Walpole would think, would be to keep it off the carpet.

But would this have satisfied these clergymen of character, with his grace at their head? Let us hear his grace upon this question. "We indeed do not threaten, if we are disregarded. But they [the dissenters] have no "more right to threaten than we: nor need "they be feared if they do. Their threatnings "have been very safely slighted, in a point "which they have much more at heart, I "mean the test: and so they may in this."*

It is, I think, pretty certain, (if we may credit some other parts of his grace's letter) that the clergy of character, particularly the bishops, never ceased to desire, and we must suppose, to endeavour, that bishops should be established in America, from the revolution to the day of the date of his letter to Mr. Walpole. During this whole interval, these desires have been so far disregarded, that in his grace's language, the affair never came upon the carpet. If it should, and the administration were to oppose it, "some of those clergymen of character, who wish it success, might in his grace's "opinion, be tempted to say indecent things "of them."

* Page 25.

Now, in my ideas, this has something the air of a threat, in case the administration should not behave as these clergymen of character would have them.

However his grace would have it believed, that mere disregard, even for so long a time as sixty years, had not produced the least murmur, that could be called a menace. But where are the mortals whose patience, after so long an interval, may not be worn out? How far this was the case, with the bishop of Oxford at least, in the year 1750, we shall see presently.

In the mean time, it must be a pleasant consideration to Mr. Walpole, that the prejudices of the jacobites and the tories against the king and his ministry, might be allayed by appointing bishops for America, as his grace suggests;* adding, that, "till these people are reconci-"led, our domestic affairs will never be on a "firm and easy footing." Indeed he gives Mr. Walpole no great encouragement to hope that such instances of kindness, would work any great or speedy reformation among them; "but," says his grace, "some good effect "they must produce; and perseverance in a "due regimen will at length compleat the "cure."†

Which expedient would not be unhappily hit off, but for one objection on the part of the friends of his Majesty and his government. For as this american episcopacy seems to have been, in his grace's ideas, one principal ingredient in that due regimen which was to com-

* Page 25. † Page 26.

pleat the cure of jacobitism and toryism, a perseverance in the administration of it, might suggest the neccssity of incrcasing the dose from time to time, till it should bc totally modelled, not only to the taste, but the constitution of the patients, *i. e.* till it came to be a perfectly *Laudæan* episcopacy; which would be an instance of kindness to these prejudiced people, to which, though it might be to his grace's palate, the friends to the protestant settlement, would, no doubt, have considerable objections.

Thus far by way of friendly innuendo, of what might happen in case of a refusal. In what follows, his grace speaks a little plainer.

"On the other hand," says his grace, "I "apprehend, the rejection of this proposal "will do the government by far more hurt "amongst the churchmen, than it can possibly "do them good amongst the dissenters. When "the bishops are asked about it, as they fre-"quently are by their clergy and others, what "must they answer? We cannot with truth "express disapprobation of it, or indifference "to it. If we did, we should be thought un-"worthy of our stations. Must we then be "forced to say, that we are all satisfied of the "absolute fitness, the great advantages, the "perfect safety of the thing, and have repeat-"edly pressed for it, but cannot prevail? "Would not this both sadly diminish our abi-"lity of serving the government, by shewing "how little credit we have with it; and make "very undesircable impressions on many minds, "concerning the king, and those that are in "authority under him; as incapable of being

" won by the arguments or intreaties of those,
" who have so strong a zeal for them, to do an
" innocent favour to the church? Still, if we
" cannot succeed by respectful applications, I
" know it is our duty to make the best of the
" matter, and not disturb the public welfare,
" because, in this particular, we are unable to
" promote it. I would speak as gently of the
" affair as ever I could, where there was dan-
" ger of doing harm; though I speak so ear-
" nestly, where I would fain hope to do good.
" But no mildness or prudence will wholly or
" nearly prevent the abovementioned conse-
" quences." *

And what are the abovementioned consequences? Even as much hurt to government as can arise, on the one hand, from a diminution of the credit of the bishops, and consequently of their ability of serving the government; and on the other, from the resentment of the clergy, on the disappointment of a project on which all of them, of any character, have set their hearts. And as his grace apprehends, that this will do the government more hurt than any good the rejection of it will do them among the dissenters can make amends for, we must conclude that it would be at the peril of the government to oblige the one and disoblige the other.

"We do not threaten," says his grace, "when
" we are disregarded."—"Why no, my lord,"
might Mr. Walpole have answered, "not in
" the terms of a Covent-Garden bully; your
" lordship only gives us civilly to understand,

* Page 26, 27.

"what a nest of wasps your episcopal repre-
"sentations can raise about our ears, if we do
"not behave like good boys; and how much
"less formidable the threatenings of the dis-
"senters would be, than the gentle, mild, and
"prudent remonstrances of our own spiritual
"fathers, with a numerous clergy at their
"beck."

Did the dissenters, when soliciting the repeal of the test act, carry their menaces farther than this? So his grace thought fit to tell Mr. Walpole, reminding him at the same time, that their threatenings, on that occasion, had been very safely slighted.*

I am afraid, Mr. Walpole would be inclined to question the truth of this representation; and probably, had he thought his grace's letter worth his notice, would have told him, that the application of the dissenters to have the test repealed, so far as it related to his majesty's protestant subjects, was not slighted. The answers given them were respectful, and they dutifully acquiesced in the reasons that were assigned, why their request could not be complied with. This is meant of the body of the dissenters, which, as his grace has well observed, is not to be denominated from "a few "busy, warm men among them."

It is upon record, that the wise and good king William, was desirous to oblige the dissenters in this point, without any particular application from them. It is equally well known, that the two excellent princes, George I.

* Page 25.

and George II. were no less disposed to comply with the several applications made on that behalf by the dissenters; and such likewise were the sentiments of Mr. Walpole and his noble brother; and such will ever be the sentiments of all true patriots, and well wishers to the protestant religion, and the protestant government of this country.

There were indeed threatenings on those occasions, which were not slighted, threatenings from the high-church party, many of them, in substance, though not exactly in stile, the same with these gentle and friendly admonitions of the bishop of Oxford. These made due impressions upon the statesmen of those days, whose experience had taught them, that it was safer to slight the threatenings of any sort of men, rather than those of an incensed and vindictive high-church clergy. Very few, who either remember the transactions of those times, or have read the history of them, will think, that these latter threatenings had a less share in supporting the test, than either the expediency of the law or a mere contempt for the dissenters.

I have now gone through his grace's letter to Mr. Walpole, on the subject of american bishops: and the remaining question is only this, whether his grace was capable of writing a letter so full of gross mistakes, inconsistencies, artful misrepresentations, and unmanly calumnies, to a statesman, who, from the nature of his situation, was so capable of detecting and confuting them. The alternative is obvious. If the letter is spurious, the forgers of it are unpardonable, not only on account of

a base imposition upon the public, but for traducing the memory of a great man, who departed so lately, full of days and honour, and in the odour of sanctity. If the letter is genuine, his encomiasts must have been egregiously mistaken, who have ascribed to him, not only eminent abilities in the province of authorship, but an uncommon measure of judgment, candour, moderation, and integrity in the administration of his high office; virtues and endowments which the writer of such a letter must have possessed in a very moderate degree.

The whole case is now before the public: and if any one should be inclined to think, that his grace hath been treated in these papers with more freedom than is consistent with a decent regard to his grace's station and character, let it be considered, that if this letter is a forgery, these remarks upon it are a full justification of his grace from the imputations which are necessarily suggested by the contents of it. If it is genuine, be it understood, that truth and righteousness are no respecters of persons, are of no party, nor at all more attached to the mitre and lawn, than to the sackcloth and ashes of a pretended penitent. And be it farther noticed, that he who contrives to spread bad principles, and to recommend mischievous projects after his demise, which he does not chuse to publish and avow in his life time, is no longer intitled to the benefit of that common maxim, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum.*

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

THAT it may not be said that mere prejudice hath prevailed so far in drawing up these remarks, as to leave no room for justice, I here declare my entire concurrence with his grace in one maxim adopted by him, at page 6, however unfortunate I may think him in his application of it to the promotion of american episcopacy.

The maxim is this:—*Against things evidently right and useful, no dangers ought to be pleaded, but such as are very probable and great.* His grace saw the rectitude and usefulness of settling bishops in our american colonies in so strong a point of light, and the dangers which would attend it, at so great a distance, and in so diminutive a size, that he ventured this aphorism with all security, nothing doubting, but the public would readily take his word for one member of his premises, as a consummate divine, and for the other, as a prelate of great *moderation* and *sincerity*, which would intitle him to his conclusion of course.

There were however times and occasions, when and where this maxim made very little impression upon his grace, and when and where the application of it, in the opinion of many serious and thinking christians, was full as

apposite, as it was in the case of american bishops.

It is well known, that several very important objections have been made to some particulars in our established forms; that alterations and amendments in these have been suggested by learned and conscientious men, both among the clergy and the laity; and that they who have solicited such amendments, have demonstrated, to the satisfaction of all capable and disinterested judges, that such amendments would be not only right and useful, but void of all danger, except from the opposition of those, who ought to be the first to promote them.

How stood his grace affected to these alterations and amendments? Even just as his grace, in this letter, represents the dissenters at home, and the non-conforming colonists abroad, to be affected towards his project of episcopizing America, warm and busy, and zealous to disappoint every thing tending to encourage them, and threatening the public with dolorous consequences, if any of the several reformations proposed, should take place.

For this purpose his grace's agents were set to work in every quarter, and having once more revived the ridiculous clamour of the danger of the church, they were not ashamed to represent the remonstrants on the behalf of a reformation, as aiming to root up the foundations of the establishment; as, seeking, under the pretence of amendment, to break loose from all institutions and forms; as proposing to set fire to the whole edifice, because some

minute parts of it are not perfectly adapted to the rest: and lastly, as concurring with those sons of licentiousness, who think that laws are superfluous things, and that civil societies were instituted to be torn to pieces by discords.*

Dr. Markham, dean of Christ's church, of whose oratory this is a specimen, could hardly be unconscious that he had here employed the figure hyperbole with great freedom. But he would take it for granted his audience would understand him, and particularly one of them, who had already apprised the world how much utility, in cases of this nature, had the advantage of truth.

It was honest enough in him, however, to tell the company first, and afterwards so many of his readers as understand latin, where he learned his knack. For he immediately subjoins, that, "it was hardly possible for him, "or any one else to deal in such matters, "without calling to mind that man, who "among our prelates had obtained the sove-"reignty, and by whose death, we grieve for "the diminished dignity of our church." A pretty compliment, by the way, to the survivors; to which, lest he should not be understood, he adds a little afterwards, "the church "would have a great loss of such a man in her "most flourishing times, but much more in "her present penury!"

What effect this petulant insult might have upon the venerable body to which it was ad-

* See Dr. Markham's *Oratiuncula*, at the end of his *Concio ad Clerum*, before the convocation, *Jan.* 25 1769.

dressed, I shall not presume to guess; but I confess, when I recollect, even without looking into the court calendar, ten or a dozen names who were either actually or virtually present on that occasion, and who are far from being overvalued in point of abilities, by being put in comparison with the late archbishop Secker, my resentment is provoked, and I am unavoidably urged to examine upon what grounds this unjust preference is given to the orator's hero and grand exemplar.

"He was, saith Mr. Markham, a strenuous "[propugnator] both of our faith and disci- "pline." Our faith and discipline; that is, the faith and discipline of the church of England. The idea of a gladiator, is not quite so suitable to the character of a defender of the christian faith and discipline: and the plain meaning of this encomium is, that his grace was an obstinate maintainer of whatsoever was established, right or wrong; whether agreeable to the gospel of Christ, or not. However, to make his grace look as like a good christian and a good protestant as he could, he hath added, *ubique tamen sine acerbitate dissentiens;* which I know not well how to render, as, a strenuous champion dissenting from his adversary without bitterness, exhibits a discordancy in one and the same character, not very easy to be conceived: unless we may be allowed to suppose that his grace's propugnatorial spirit, was glossed over with an insidious mildness, by way of a mask, till he could take his adversary at a proper advantage. For if his grace's mildness and moderation, were either truly natural, or truly christian dispositions, it is

impossible Dr. Markham should be put in mind of archbishop Secker, in the midst of the bitterest railings, misrepresentations, and even scurrilities, thrown out against those who attempted only to reform his grace's beloved establishment of faith and discipline.

Having done with his grace's controversial character, Dr. Markham proceeds to give an account of his literary abilities, where, having allowed that, "his grace's stile was not the "most polished," he insists, that, "no one "ever outstripped him, in copiousness, me-"thod, and gravity."

Did the doctor never hear of Thomas Aquinas? However, these are excellencies it must be owned; but excellencies of which every laborious compiler of a good common-place book may equally boast.

This mediocrity in his grace's proficiency as a writer, is the more surprising, in that we are told, at the end of the next paragraph, that, "there never was a man of leisure who laboured "more in literary studies, than his grace did "in a most busy station."

As Dr. Markham, no doubt, expects to be believed, we will for once, take his word for this remarkable fact, and only inquire how his grace acquitted himself in his department of business.

And here his grace is held forth to us, as, "a magistrate, who laid it down for a principal "rule of his conduct, to be wanting to no part "of his duty, and this in the midst of a mul-"tiplicity of cares with which he was daily "beset."

I freely acknowledge that I cannot form an

idea of a magistrate in the church of Christ, without adding to it the idea of usurpation. In the church of antichrist, a magistrate is a necessary character. His representative must, from the nature of his trust, be invested with compulsive powers, equipped with an inquisition, and other means of inflicting pains and penalties upon those who dissent from his particular system.

It is not for the honour of archbishop Secker to suppose that he affected magistracy in the least degree; much less, that, in the exercise of such office, he was wanting to no part of it; as that must imply a desire at least to execute penal laws against heretics and schismatics, to incapacitate dissenters, by imposing upon them tests and subscriptions to points of his own devising, and never to suffer one of them to escape his vigilance when he could lay hold of him.

There is, I think, but one reason why the archbishop should desire to be invested with the powers of magistracy. He had but poor luck in the province of church-champion. He was generally worsted whenever he met his adversary upon the plain field of controversy, whether he chose to engage on english ground, or went in quest of adventures to a foreign land. At home, his own artillery was dexterously turned upon him.* Abroad, his ligurian arts and subterfuges were completely

* In a spirited and ingenious pamphlet, intitled, *Remarks upon the first of three letters against the Confessional*, p. 24—36. N. B. The second and third of these letters are not the archbishop's, but the work of an every way inferior hand.

defeated, merely by the dint of an honest heart, a good cause, and a skilful hand.* It is true in these conflicts, his grace laid aside the insignia of his order, but some how or other, the adversary got a peep at his countenance through the chinks of his visor, and after that, there was no avoiding the disgrace of being vanquished by caitiff knights of low degree.

It is no wonder that repeated mortifications of this kind should raise a little aspiration in the breast of an impatient prelate, to an office in which he might take his amends with more advantage. How far he acted, on this consideration, in the character of a church magistrate, Dr. Markham may know better than I do. But whatever his grace's diligence and vigilance were in this department, it is plain, if we may believe Dr. Markham, he had very little success; for the Dr. tells us, not without some seeming regret, that, "there never was "a time when men lived and thought more "according to their own judgment." Whereas, if things had proceeded prosperously on the magistratical plan of faith and discipline, men ought to have lived and thought according to the judgment of archbishop Secker and Dr. Markham.

The doctor concludes his panegyric (which he modestly acknowledges to be short and jejune) with the following flourish of his art. "In some men we discern an excellent genius,

* See *Remarks on an anonymous tract, intitled,*—An Answer to Dr. Mayhew's Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign Parts. By *Jonathan Mayhew*, pastor of the *West church in Boston*, London, re-printed for *W. Nicoll*, 1765.

"and a multiplicity of science, in others, "prudence, authority, probity, constancy; "but we shall not easily find one in whom all "all these have so abundantly met together."

I have no inclination to dissect this complication of excellencies; let every one judge of it as he sees cause. I allow, on the one hand, that an exalted station is a great brightener; and on the other, that an Oxford orator may be indulged in a little fiction; but his grace's writings are serious things, and are a just criterion for any one who is disposed to verify this accumulation of virtues and good qualities, without looking for a parallel either among the living or the dead.

It is as impossible for me to mention an Oxford orator without thinking of Dr. Burton,* as it was for Dr. Markham to scourge the advocates for reformation, without thinking of archbishop Secker.

Dr. Burton takes his grace up indeed a little late in life, not sooner than his 28th year; whence our great grandchildren, reading the contents of this panegyric in its fortieth edition, will naturally conclude, that his grace owed his immense proficiency *in omni scibili* (physick excepted) solely to the doctrine and discipline of the university of Oxford; little dreaming that he received the slightest rudiments among the "irritable, perverse, malignant, seditious, "and intolerably tyrannical puritans."† And

* JOHANNIS BURTON ad amicum Epistola; sive commentariolus THOMÆ SECKER, Archiep. Cantuar. Memoriæ Sacer. OXONII, E Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1768.

† Epist. p. 27, 28.

yet, as he turned out in the end, so compleatly furnished with imperatorial arts,* it is not at all unnatural to suppose that he might have picked up and retained some slight maxims of hierarchical discipline among these "tyranni-"cal" dissenters, with whom his early connexions are not yet absolutely forgotten.

I am sorry my time will not allow me to go through this elaborate epistle, which furnishes in every page abundant matter for very edifying reflections, particularly on the frailty of bigotted and injudicious panegyrists, who void of every idea of justice, moderation, or propriety, where their idol is to be exhibited, give occasion to those who are not quite so prone to credulity, to look farther into a character so bedaubed with fulsome adulation, than they might otherwise be disposed to do.

Dr. Burton, for example, holds up his grace as one of the princes of critics in hebrew literature, and for this he sends us to Mr. Merrick's annotations on the psalms.† This might pass well enough with those who took Dr. Burton for a competent judge, at least for two or three months after the publication of his epistle. But Dr. Gregory Sharpe, having, after that interval, shewn how far his grace had waded out of his depth in that province, the encomium now serves for nothing, but to give suspicions, that there are more of them in the pamphlet, upon equally precarious grounds.‡

* Page 14. † Epist. page 6.

‡ *Vide*:—A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Oxford, from the Master of the Temple, containing some Strictures made by his grace the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in the

Add to this, that some suspicions having been raised by the freedom of his grace's speculations on revealed religion in the earlier part of his life, nothing could be more injudicious than to attempt to embellish his grace's character, by sending the reader to a few insipid cavils against some striking parts of a very learned and able *defence of* CHRISTIANITY.*

Again, it was objected to his grace, that he was out of measure provoked at every attempt to amend or reform our ecclesiastical system in those particulars where it is most exceptionable: that whenever such proposals appeared, he was out of all patience, summoning his myrmidons from every quarter, and oftentimes lending his own hand to the confutation of these innovators and schismatics. This, numbers of his grace's admirers would never believe, supposing that his grace, who had profited so much by his own free examination, could not be so violently embittered himself, or afford his patronage and countenance to those who were, against men who had an equal right to judge for themselves. But Dr. Burton soon put the matter out of doubt, by acknowledging in one place, his grace for the author of the feeble answer to Dr. Mayhew,† and in another by divulging, that his grace not only undertook the office of propugnator himself, against the slanders of schismatics and innovators, but used the vicarious assistance of others who fought under his standard.‡

It is true, the Dr. says, he took the same

Reverend Mr. Merrick's Annotations on the Pſalms. London, 1769.

* See the Remarks cited above, Note (*b*) p. 87.

† Epiſt. page 28. ‡ Ibid. p. 21.

course with the calumnies of the papists. It might be so; but the evidence here is a little obscure: in the other case it is clear and decisive.

It has been often asserted, and as often denied, that his grace kept a record of clerical delinquents, commonly called a black book, in which were registered the names and offences of those who had the misfortune to fall under his grace's displeasure; and that the better to detect defaulters, his grace had his spies and emissaries properly distributed to give the necessary information. Dr. Burton seems to give credit to the affirmative, by assuring us, that his grace, "animadverted upon every "thing relating to the clergy; that he had his "*internuntii*, and used the ministry of others "in his disquisitions; sought out and noted "every thing; and finally, digested his dis-"coveries into a kind of *fasti*, by way of a pro-"vincial history, for the use of his successors."* It would be strange if there should not be one column of this calendar appropriated to the *carbone notandi*.

But our greatest obligations to Dr. Burton arise from his candid and undisguised account of the motives of his grace's zeal for american episcopacy. His grace, it seems, understood by his books, that episcopal government was of apostolical original: He perceived likewise [how, it is not said, perhaps by instinct] that there was a kindred connexion between episcopacy and monarchy.† And with these convictions upon his mind, "what wonder, saith "Dr. Burton, that our arch-prelate should

* Page 25. † Page 26.

" favour the pious desires of those Americans, " who having embraced the faith and discipline " of the church of England, coveted to have " episcopal administrations more within their " reach?" This was kind and compassionate!

But the misfortune is, that the posthumous publication of his grace's letter to Mr. Walpole, hath made it questionable, whether these motives did not work considerably towards their effect, without these pious desires, and long before his grace was possessed of the archprelacy. That Dr. Burton was well acquainted with his grace's motives for promoting episcopal government in America, there can be no doubt, after his commerce of friendship with his grace, for more than forty years.* But some possibly may suspect, that the Dr. knew little more of their operation than merely the ostensible parts of it.

And yet from his assigning, or at least intimating a third motive for his grace's zeal in this american business, I am apt to think Dr. Burton knew more of this matter than he thought fit to divulge.

It seems our domestic dissenters, forming their judgment upon Dr. Secker's gentleness and lenity, and his earnestness to support the right of toleration (not without some retrospect, it is likely, to his more early principles and connexions) expected his grace would at a proper time, "betray to them the privileges " and authority of the church of England."†

There was no way so effectual to convince

* Page 4. † Page 27.

them of their mistakes, as to discover his ardent zeal to episcopize their brethren in America. What other methods his grace might take to undeceive them, it is not material to inquire. According to Dr. Burton, it must have been this circumstance in his grace's conduct which chiefly opened their eyes, as it derived upon his grace their most furious resentment.

This being the case, we have here a third motive for his grace's zeal for american episcopacy, distinct from apostolical and monarchical relations, inducing a suspicion, that the impious aversion of some to american episcopacy, might have as great a share in his grace's attempts to establish it, as the pious desires of others.

If it were worth the while, one might pick out abundant matter of amusement, from a comparison of Dr. Burton's elogy with that of Dr. Markham's. Both of them seem to have been conscious, that the transmitting the most unexceptionable character to posterity, without some alloy of human infirmity, hath given occasion to the inquisitive reader oftentimes to question the good faith of the historian, or the sincerity of the panegyrist. They seem however not to be agreed, where the *nævi* in archbishop Secker's portrait should be inserted.

Dr. Markham is inclined to place the chief imperfection in his grace's stile. But this Dr. Burton cannot be supposed to allow; having submitted his own valuable labours to his grace's polishing hand, which, according to the Dr. performed this office with the utmost accuracy.*

* Epist. Page 30.

Dr. Markham, again, thinks, that, "the "chief duty of magistracy, is to apply, with "diligence to the ordering those businesses "which occur in the daily course of things;" and in this article, the Dr. affirms, that the archbishop, "in the multiplicity of cares "with which he was distracted, neglected "nothing."

But Dr. Burton is of another opinion; he requires in a magistrate an imperious obstinacy and arrogance, in which, according to him, his grace was extremely defective; and informs us, that, had his grace exercised his authority to the full, and not given way to the times, he would have much more effectually provided for the common good. "For had this prince "of ecclesiastics exerted himself, he might, "according to Dr. Burton, (in conjunction "with his Majesty, both of them acting as the "avengers and satellites of despised and vio-"lated religion) have totally defeated that "hundred-headed beast, impiety, which para-"ded with impunity among almost all ranks "of men." And he gives us no obscure intimations, that had he been in his grace's seat, matters would have gone much better; that is to say, "authority would have been restored "to the laws, its proper honour to piety, re-"verence to the ecclesiastical order, nor, "perhaps would the Americans have been de-"prived of an hierarchy."* Such is the courage and spirit of those who breathe the atmosphere of wholesome severities!

This lenity it is, that Dr. Burton exhibits as

* Epist. Page, 35, 36.

the late archbishop's grand foible; taking care however to inform us, that, "it was not so "much the effect of the sentiments or the will "of the man, as of a certain political necessity "of the times."* In which, I am apt to believe, few people, who knew his grace, would disagree with him.

Such are the encomiums of the doctors, Burton and Markham, who, by their officious interposition, may be fairly said to have left their hero in a much worse condition than they found him, and (to borrow an expression from the celebrated Junius) "to have injured him "by their assistance."

On this charge of lenity, however, I am of opinion, a willing advocate might find something to say for his grace. There certainly were times and occasions when he was by no means defective in this arrogance of magistracy required by Dr. Burton. And I will only add, that it would be to his grace's honour, if it could be proved, that, in those instances, he was less influenced by his own temper and principles, than by the counsels and instigation of such men as these adulatory orators.

* Page 36.

FINIS.

A

LETTER

WRITTEN BY A

COUNTRY CLERGYMAN,

TO

ARCHBISHOP HERRING.

In the YEAR M DCC L IV.

[FIRST PRINTED, M DCC LXXI.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE original of this letter was lately found among the papers of a gentleman who was formerly about the person of the great prelate to whom they are addressed. It was inclosed in a cover directed to his grace, and stamped with the mark of the Post-office from whence it was dispatched, and might possibly be put into the hands of the person in whose custody it was found, with some view of his publishing something by way of animadversion on its contents, of which this gentleman was full as capable as any one man in the kingdom, who hath no better cause to manage. But the policy of the church taking a turn about that time, to the peaceable counsels of STIFLEING, (in which she hath since been uncommonly successful, even with respect to such writings as have passed the press) it is conjectured, that all contentious operation upon this letter had been countermanded, upon the consideration, that what

would be gained by exposing the folly and zeal of this remonstrant, would by no means pay the expence in any returns of interest to the church, or of renown to the great man to whom the remonstrance was made. But these motives for suppressing it, having no weight with the editor, the letter is now offered to the public, rather as a matter of curiosity, than with any expectation that the church, or the pillars which support her, should be either the better or the worse for it. It is only necessary to add, that though the editor is sensible there are several errors in the manuscript, he hath here given a literal copy of it in print, to prevent all surmise that it is either a fictitious production, or a counterfeit resemblance of a genuine epistle, which several persons now living know to have been received by the archbishop at the time it bears date.

A

LETTER

TO THE

Moſt Reverend the Lord Archbiſhop of

CANTERBURY,

FROM A

PRIVATE CLERGYMAN.

MY LORD,

THE relation which every clergyman bears to the fathers of the church in which he is a minister, and particularly to the prelate at the head of them, will, I hope, incline your grace to diſpenſe with ſome want of form in this address, which comes from an inferior of that order, and more especially when your grace is informed that the subject of these papers is, in the writer's opinion, of the highest importance to the welfare and credit of the christian church.

I am very sensible how little your grace's momentous occupations will admit of interruption on a less interesting subject; nor would it appear to be proper or pardonable to give your grace more trouble on this, than is abso-

lutely necessary to explain the case in hand, and to recommend it to your grace's serious consideration; to which it is humbly submitted without farther preface or apology.

Your grace will need no information from me concerning the rise, progress and event of a late application to the public from the press in favour of a review of our liturgy; an application which has been thought by many sincere friends to our church and civil constitution, to have deserved a very particular regard from the bench where your grace presides; and which, as is said, it might have had, provided it had been introduced to their notice with proper circumstances, and by a sufficiently considerable hand. Concerning which, as I know nothing, I have nothing to say, but what every serious christian should think; that if the cause itself had any intrinsic merit, it ought not to have been rejected by such a body of men for the want of a few formalities, or even for the want of any thing, but the possibility of altering any of our present forms upon any terms whatever.

Be that as it may. The consequences of that attempt, feeble and unsupported as it appeared to be when it was made, are such as plainly discover the proposal has not wanted the attention of very able and worthy men, whom the plain and honest state of undeniable facts, in the *Free and Candid Disquisitions*, seems to have incouraged to publish their sentiments on one of the points there treated on, with a freedom which is almost without precedent on so delicate a subject.

Your grace will perceive I am referring to

the author of the *Essay on Spirit*, and the writers who have seconded that performance, whose inquiries have set the athanasian controversy in so new, and at the same time so striking a point of light, that a serious clergyman who should hereafter venture to subscribe to our common forms, without a competent search in the scriptures whether these things are so, would probably, upon reflexion, find some difficulty to justify himself to his own heart.

That your grace is not wholly unmindful of this perplexing case, the world is made very sensible by the second page of Mr. Knowles's answer to the above-mentioned essay. An answer by no means satisfactory even to the athanasians themselves, some of whom have been heard to say, that it was neither worthy of the cause it pretends to vindicate, nor of your grace's patronage.

In the mean time the truly conscientious clergy are anxious and discouraged. The arguments offered against this creed, and many other things which occur in our daily ministrations, are plausible, and, for ought we know, may be just and solid. I say, my Lord, for ought we know; for your grace needs not be told, that a large majority of us have not given, nor indeed are made capable of giving matters of this nature that previous deliberation which is necessary to form a competent judgment upon them, before our entrance into the ministry. And, to that, so many parochial duties and family cares succeed, that I am afraid we of the inferior class, who are doomed to *bear the burden and heat of the day*, have

but little leisure and less means to acquire this kind of learning by our own industry, In these circumstances. and with this slender provision, it is our misfortune to be called by unavoidable occasions into a variety of companies, where with great freedom our church forms are brought into debate, as well by the members of our own communion, as dissenters and adversaries of different denominations; many of whom however, bating the reproach of an invidious name, appear to be men of candor, probity and good sense, sufficient to entitle their sentiments and observations to a very serious consideration.

In this situation, we naturally look towards our superiors for such aids and instructions as men of inferior talents and limited provinces do from time to time require. And I beg leave to assure your grace, there never was an emergency when we had more occasion.

And yet, alas! so it is, that very little of this instruction is to be had in proportion to our necessities.

Our bishop's and archdeacon's charges, when we are favoured with them, which is but seldom, are commonly short and general: consisting chiefly of declamatory encomiums on our own system, and reflexions on the principles of the adversary; of political observations which we understand not, and allusions to facts we never heard of; with, perhaps, some few gentle directions concerning our conduct, which, if they had the least experience of the condition, abilities, commerce and connexions of the inferior clergy, their lordships would know to be impracticable.

What reception at his bishop's palace a poor clergyman would meet with, who should desire more explicit rules for his behaviour on these critical occasions, I cannot guess, having never heard of any who applied for such rules, though I have known some who have earnestly desired, and very much wanted them. Their lordships are not easy of access, nor fond of being interrupted by business which cannot be dispatched by their officers.

We have heard indeed that when their lordships think proper to open themselves to particular friends, it is generally in such maxims as these:—"That we ought to acquiesce in the "wisdom of our superiors—to take no notice "of petulant objectors, unless it be to refer "them to the ancient worthies of the church, "who have, on former occasions answered all "cavils that can be brought against her, to "the satisfaction of all reasonable men."

But I am afraid their lordships do not sufficiently consider the times we live in. The laity are grown more knowing, and consequently more inquisitive than heretofore. New books have afforded new lights. The circumstances which made these old answers go down with our ancestors are quite changed. The answers are found, upon examination, to be trifling and insufficient. The objections consequently stand in the light of *new* objections to the present generation, and nothing will now satisfy them but *new* answers.

May I hope for your grace's leave to exemplify this case by a striking instance? A small tract was published not long ago with this title, *An appeal to the common sense of all christian*

people, more particularly the members of the church of England, with regard to an important point of faith and practice, imposed upon their consciences by church-authority.

In this little piece every text relating to the doctrine of the Trinity is exhibited with a short and plain comment, in language which is easily understood, if not by the meanest, yet certainly by very ordinary capacities. And if these expositions of scripture are true expositions, the errors in the athanasian creed are many and grievous.

"Aye, if they be true," says the zealous churchman. "But the luck of it is, they are "erroneous and heretical, and have been shewn "to be so by gentlemen of the first name for "learning and judgment, who have under-"taken and effected the vindication of this "creed, long before the author of the appeal "was born."

It may be so. But then here is the misfortune. These gentlemen, unable as it should seem, to give a plain easy sense to these texts favourable to their own side (as is done by the appellant, not only from the drift of the context, but by a fair comparison with parallel places) are obliged to have recourse to laboured criticisms on particular words, to scholastic distinctions, philosophical definitions, and arbitrary interpretations of fathers and popes, which by no art of man can be made plain to common understandings.

It is in vain therefore, my lord, to refer plain christians to these old answers for their satisfaction. These scientific expositions of the athanasian doctors may be orthodox, may be

critical, may be just; but while they lie in this obscurity to vulgar apprehensions, there will always be this reasonable prejudice against the truth of them; namely, that the gospel of Christ was preached to and designed for the use of the poor; and consequently, what the poor do not, and cannot be made to understand, is either no part of the genuine gospel of Christ, or no such part as ought to give either poor or rich any great concern about the meaning of it.

"Very well," says the defendant, "we do not "insist upon your understanding the athana- "sian creed; we only say you should believe "the doctrine of it in general, which we sup- "pose you may understand, if you will; and "for the rest, the best advice we can give you "is to acquiesce, and not to disturb the church "with your private scruples and objections "which she does not inquire after. Satisfy "yourselves, and you satisfy us."

To this my lord, it is replied on the part of the people, that the reason of their applying to others for satisfaction, is because they *cannot* satisfy themselves. They do not know how they shall understand and believe doctrines in general which consist of particular propositions that are not to be understood. They desire to acquiesce. But in what shall they acquiesce? Shall they acquiesce in an obligation to believe, upon the peril of their salvation, what they do not, cannot understand? This is precisely what creates their anxiety. The people are not critics and philosophers, but they have their share of common sense. They have not enough of that kind of sense which

is requisite for understanding the athanasian creed; but they have sense enough to know that they had better believe any thing than perish everlastingly. The church requires them to denounce with their own mouths, eternal perdition upon themselves and all others who do not believe the contents of the athanasian creed. They cannot be made to understand that the contents of this creed are conformable to the gospel of Christ. On the other side, they are made to understand, by plain arguments, that there is great probability the athanasian doctrine is not conformable to the doctrine of the gospel. The church still persists in requiring them to believe and denounce as above, without affording any new lights to their understandings. Is this a state for a reasonable creature to acquiesce in? Is this the method in which the fathers of the church should treat those souls for whom Christ died? Is this the way to *support the weak*, and to *comfort the feeble-minded?*

The short case is this. The church will neither explain her doctrine to the people, nor suffer them to acquiesce in their ignorance of it. She discourages their inquiries, and yet forces them to be inquisitive. She obliges them to be explicit in condemning themselves and others to eternal misery, for that which she either cannot or will not shew them to be a crime. She has not yet *ex cathedrâ* either condemned or confuted the *Essay on spirit*, or the *Appeal to common sense*. And yet holds with Athanasius that the authors of them both shall perish everlastingly. For assuredly neither of these men think of the Trinity, as the church

by the mouth of Athanasius pronounces every one must think, who will be saved.

This conduct of the church of England, my lord, I call unreasonable, nay I call it unchristian. And I should call it unreasonable and unchristian, if the church of England were arian, and should deal the same measure to the athanasians. Whilst churches and churchmen forsake the spirit, the simplicity, the charity, and edification of the gospel, and betake themselves to the cunning craftiness of worldly politics, they may be athanasians, arians, socinians, papists, episcopalians, presbyterians, anabaptists, quakers, methodists, or whatever else you please to call them, but christians they cannot be.

The gospel says, *prove all things, hold fast that which is good.* The policy of the church says, "hold fast all things good and bad, tight "and close. The church of England is a "compact body, and has the law on her side. "Adhere to the establishment as such with all "your heart and soul, and if there be ever so "many remonstrants against particular de-"fects, superfluities or corruptions, answer "them not a word. They must comply or "starve."

O my lord! did the protestants set up upon these principles? Had there been one protestant in the world, if these principles had prevailed?

For, that I may not be mistaken by your grace, the remonstrants I mean to plead for are those only who are so upon protestant principles; who have no other view in calling

for a reform, than to have the government, the discipline and the worship of the church reduced to, and regulated by, the genuine principles of the christian religion. In how many instances the church of England is said, and I am afraid, proved to have deviated from, and counteracted these principles, your grace has no occasion to be informed by me.

It is in vain to say, as some would pretend, that these remonstrances are no more than the clamours and cant of some discontented or some fanatical spirits. The treatises that have been written to solicit a review of our church affairs, shame this pretence even to ridicule. They demonstrate to all impartial and disinterested judges, that, let the station and influence of the authors be what it will, there are but few better or wiser men in the three kingdoms.

But be this as it may. The want of a reformation is felt and confessed by thousands who do not desire to be judges for the public, or even for themselves, in a matter of this consequence. They are contented to have the cause referred to parliament, to a royal commission, in short to any select body of sincere capable and disinterested christians, and by the decisions of such a body they will bind themselves to abide.

They desire indeed to except against the convocation, not merely for the sake of what has formerly happened in assemblies so called, but on account of a notion they entertain, that our bishops and great churchmen are disaffected to any reformation in the church, and steadily determined to obstruct it, as far as in

them lies, in every shape. They think their lordships, if they would put their hands heartily to the work, setting forth a true state of the case in a proper petition to the throne, they might certainly accomplish it without much difficulty or inconvenience. Whilst this, in our present circumstances, remains undone or unattempted, serious men have no way of accounting for this acquiescence of their lordships, but by supposing either that their lordships are convinced that all is perfectly right in the church, and agreeable to the word of God; or that their lordships are afraid their present repose might be disturbed, or their revenues diminished; suspecting probably that a thorough reformation might end in an increase of their episcopal labours, a reduction of their superfluous expences, and consequently of the funds which supply it.

The first of these can hardly be the case. It is next to impossible their lordships should suffer so many impressions to be made upon the people to the disadvantage of the church, without one sensible word of an answer, if their lordships were really convinced that the church is free from the many blemishes imputed to her.

And if their lordships raise their objections to a reform in the church from any apprehensions that their own ease and affluence may in the event be affected by it, long experience hath taught us in many similar cases, how little we are to expect from reasons and arguments drawn from public utility and edification, when opposed to considerations of this kind.

It is however an opinion espoused by men who are not suspected of wanting either candor or judgment, that if the laity both in high and low stations were not become corrupt, dissolute and trifling to an extreme degree, and averse and inattentive to almost every thing serious and of public importance, it would not be possible for the clergy, obstinate and determined as they are, to prevent an effectual examination into the present state of our ecclesiastical affairs. "No people, in all history," say these gentlemen, "have been known "to subsist for any long time under such a "load of vice and impiety as we have among "us. Nor is it possible our people should be "so deeply infected with these fatal corruptions, but through the negligence and evil "examples of the public teachers of religion; "whose manners, employments, principles "and abilities, should therefore be the first "and most immediate object of a parliamentary inquiry."

An heavy charge, my lord, upon the clergy! But how shall we acquit ourselves? Shall we say, or should we be believed in saying, that the clergy do their duty in all respects? That they are, in general, laborious, faithful and vigilant in the pastoral care; patient and gentle towards all men; modest, humble and condescending to the poor as well as the rich; contented with their station, and unambitious of wealth and power; *in all things approving themselves as the ministers of God, and ensamples to the flock, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity?*—If this be true, it can hardly be true too, that the flock

of God, having thus their portion of spiritual food in due season, should profit so little under the ministry of such pastors. Lay the two facts together, and the plain consequence will be, that our office is absolutely useless, and that the public might very well spare the millions that are expended upon a particular order of men, under the notion of rewarding a service they cannot possibly perform, namely, that of making the individuals of the community better than they would be otherwise for all the purposes of civil society.

But let God be true, and every man who makes these inferences, a liar. The premises are false, and the conclusion is impious; inasmuch as the reflexion suggested in it would fall not upon the clergy, but upon the christian religion itself, which will never be found to have fallen so far short in its influence, where the means of knowledge and edification it affords have been duly and faithfully dispensed.

The alternative then is, that the clergy are slothful and secular, either unfit for the office they have undertaken, or unconcerned about the faithful discharge of it; and so upon examination we find it.

The collective body of the clergy, excepting a very inconsiderable number, consists of men whose lives and ordinary occupations are most foreign to their profession. We find among them all sorts of secular characters; courtiers, politicians, lawyers, merchants, usurers, civil magistrates, sportsmen, musicians, stewards of country squires, and tools of men in power, and even companions of rakes and infidels:

not to mention the ignorant herd of poor curates, to whom the instruction of our common people is committed, who are accordingly, in religious matters, the most ignorant common people that are in any protestant, if not in any christian society upon the face of the earth.

There are to be found among the clergy of our church, geniuses who are fit for almost any thing but the particular character and function they have undertaken, or rather into which they have been driven; and I am much mistaken if a college of apostles would not find a large majority of us much fitter for something else.

Such an one has been of great service in an election, or has made an excellent poem, or understands the management of horses, or the improvement of estates. But his circumstances are slender; and it is a thousand pities he is not better provided for.—Why, has he greek and latin enough to translate a verse in the testament, or to turn an article? O by all means prefer him in the church, and give him a living.——Would there not be as much propriety in making him a general officer, or a lord chief justice?

What is amazing in the affair is, that men may be met with who insist that all this is as it should be, and who do not see why a gentleman should be restrained from exerting his talents, and being useful or entertaining in a secular capacity, because he happens to be a clergyman.

It is not worth the while to examine the reasonings of such people. They are very miserable of course; and are all founded upon a

πρῶτον ψεῦδος, a capital error in our church-government, which out of reverence for your grace's bench, I forbear to mention.

In those days when our disputes were on foot with that class of dissenters who will not allow of a stated ministry, we appealed with great advantage to the epistles of Paul and Peter, where the appointment of particular persons to the work of the ministry is indeed sufficiently clear. These disputes have subsided; nevertheless I suppose many of us may still think these scriptures to be none of the weakest titles we have to a maintenance in the church. But surely, my lord, with little pertinence shall we alledge them in either case, if, along with the appointment, we do not take the charge; namely, "to give ourselves "wholly to it; to wait upon it, and not to "entangle ourselves with the affairs of this "life;" and other intimations to the like effect, which are always to be found in the neighbourhood of every text that relates to the ministry. If a justice of the peace, having settled the circumstances of filiation, or a squabble about a parish rate, may with the utmost propriety put on a gown, and hold forth the important truths of the gospel to a congregation of christians, what can a sensible, serious and eloquent mechanic want to equip himself for a preacher, but to wash his hands, and to put off his apron? And what will our blessed lord and master say to us, when after a long time he cometh and reckoneth with us, for taking the lucrative part of the text along with us, and leaving the rest behind?

These, my lord, are crying scandals and

abuses, scandals to those who are without, and abuses of our own flock, who administer to us of their carnal things, and ease us of the care and trouble of providing for ourselves and families by secular employments, purely that we may dedicate ourselves and our time to their edification in Christ. Is it not, my lord, in some sort taking the children's bread and casting it to the dogs, when ignorant, vicious and secular men are admitted to, or tolerated in, the ministry? The allusion is coarse, but it is the allusion of a pious and plain-spoken prophet, who can, when his subject demands it, exalt his language not only to elegance, but even to an admired and inimitable sublimity. And shall we be so fastidious as to decline, through a false delicacy, to refer lazy and avaricious ministers to that class of animals by which the word of God hath characterized them?

If the question should be by what means and by whose instrumentality shall these abuses be corrected? Let it be previously inquired into, what the present discipline of the church will do for us? If the application of that would remedy these disorders, certainly most inexcuseable are they whose province it is to administer it, and who these are is very well known.

The 76th canon indeed says, that "No "man being admitted a deacon or minister, "shall thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the "same, nor afterward use himself in the course "of his life as a layman." But while he keeps his gown on his back, it should seem by the 75th, he may use himself as he pleases in the course of his life, provided "he does not give

"himself to any base or servile labour, or to "drinking or riot, spending his time idly by "day or by night, playing at dice, cards or "tables, or any other unlawful game." A clergyman therefore, by the leave of this canon, may be a justice of the peace, a country grazier, a nobleman's steward, or a merchant of many kinds of small wares, because none of these occupations come within the description of "base "and servile labour." On another hand, there is no canonical correction for a clerk who hunts or shoots three or four days in the week; who is to be found at every horse-race and cock-pit within ten miles of his residence, and is as spruce and alert in every party of pleasure, as the best squire among them.—The reason is (it can be no other) that these are not instances of that riot and idleness intended in the canon: for surely it will not be said that these gentlemen do not use themselves in this course of their lives as laymen, except in those few deviations from it, when they mount the desk and the pulpit.

Indeed, my lord, I am afraid the practices of many of our clergy will not admit of this commodious comment in the articles of drinking, dice, cards and tables. And yet offenders of this class are just as much connived at and secure from censure as the rest; excepting here and there a poor stupid drunken curate who has quarrelled away all his friends; and even these have no great reason to complain, their punishment seldom proceeding farther than a gentle rebuke. With respect to the article of cards, I have sometimes heard it gently whispered, *Quis custodiet ipsum custodem?*

It seems some of our great churchmen have been suspected of an itch this way.—But this is too tender a point to admit of any remarks of mine. Though some very free and reasonable ones might be made upon it, not without a number of authentic facts to support them. For the honour of the calling however, and to preserve all possible reverence for our superiors, I am willing to suppose that every kind and degree of christian discipline would be faithfully administered by them, if their hands were not unhappily tied up by the nature of our present ecclesiastical constitution,

But then, my lord, I fear it will be difficult to acquit them on another hand, either before God or man, if it be true, that, knowing and seeing, as they needs must, the tendency of this constitution, to countenance secularity, hypocrisy and prevarication in the clergy, and all manner of vice and licentiousness among the people, as well as to give strength and encouragement to impiety and infidelity, they not only are content to have it so, but do all they can to keep it so.

That the frame of our church affairs is so contrived as in too many cases to defeat all the good ends of a christian ministry, needs no great depth of penetration to discover.

A non-resident incumbent, is not only nonsense in terms, but a character so utterly inconsistent with the duties of the ministerial calling, that let him preach his four sermons in so many years, instead of so many months, like an angel, the very circumstance of turning his back upon his flock as soon as this piece of drudgery is over, and his rents in his

pocket, and leaving them to a poor curate, is sufficient to convince the first of his parishoners that dips into Paul's epistles to Timothy and Titus, that this man cannot possibly be in earnest.

The subscription of so many ministers every year to articles of religion, which many of them understand not, and many others of them believe not, (both of which have been publicly charged upon them in print very lately) affords such suspicions of impenetrable stupidity, voracious avarice, and prostituted conscience in the subscribers, as will unanswerably fix upon the church of England, as long as this state of things shall last, all that odium and contempt which reasonable and upright men have for arbitrary impositions, and mean and sordid submissions to them.

The abominable oppressions and partialities of our spiritual courts, supported, many of them, by no law, and contrary, most of them to the genius of our civil policy, as well as to the plainest precepts of the gospel, are the curse of the poor, the jest of the rich, and the abhorrence of the wise and good even among the clergy themselves.

And if to this we add the strange expressions, and childish ordinance, in our public worship, so different from the spirit and simplicity, of the piety and devotion prescribed in the gospel of Christ, and without all authority but the dreams and impositions of fantastical and factious men; who can wonder that infidelity should spread and flourish among us, under this hopeful cultivation of its prejudices against the christian religion?

Is it astonishing that such a set of men as the methodists should arise, and attempt to awaken the drowsy heads, and alarm the stupified hearts of our people, immersed as they are in all the secular security into which the doctrines and examples of their own pastors may with too much probability be supposed to have thrown them?

Who that considers, that there has not been one argument offered against a review of our church affairs; which would not have operated at the reformation with equal truth and force in favour of popery:—Who, I say, that considers this, will be surprized at the numbers which are said to be daily dropping from us into that horrid abyss of impiety and superstition?

That all these things are the subjects of your grace's meditations, as well as ours, I entertain no doubt; though very possibly your grace may contemplate some of them in a very different light from that in which they are exhibited to us, who have no way of estimating the rectitude of any thing concerning the christian religion, but according to its agreement with the written word of God; and who in consequence of that principle, as well as of some facts in ecclesiastical history, are made to believe that every thing in the frame of any church will be found inexpedient, unedifying and obstructive of the true design of christianity, in proportion as it deviates from that unerring standard.

It is true the reformation of national churches is a work full of difficulties, and has probably seldom, if ever, been effected by those

who had nothing but reformation in their view. But must it for that reason never be attempted? Is there no body whose particular business, nay even whose indispensible duty it is to attempt it?

To whom then shall we look for the beginnings of so great a blessing, with so much propriety, as to the prelate at the head of our national church? A prelate of the greatest piety? A prelate of distinguished principles in favour of truth and liberty? A prelate of known contempt for the sordid accumulation of wealth; a prelate of the most amiable and engaging humility, and upon whom the prospect of losing either his riches or his power in a righteous cause will make no impression; in a word, a prelate who having an heart to pity and an hand to relieve every human complaint, cannot be supposed to turn a deaf ear or an indifferent eye to the distresses of the most grievous, and therefore of the most moving nature; the distresses of conscientious ministers of God's word, struggling in bonds, and labouring under burdens, which they can neither bear without the most galling anguish of mind, nor break and cast off without ruin to themselves and families, and scandal to the society which they would wish to see perpetually flourishing in true honour, and deservedly a name and a praise in all the earth.

Pardon me, my good lord, if I should affirm that, in the present situation of things, and whilst your grace is in possession of your present station and talents, no considerations relating merely to the secondary and subordinate articles of human happiness, will excuse your

grace at the great day of account, for neglecting or postponing the care of those things, which respect the endless felicity of mankind. It is the souls of the people of England that are your grace's province. To your grace's charge these are committed by your God and your king: and permit me most humbly to suggest to your grace, the very little merit there will be in your grace's attention to affairs of the greatest secular importance, whilst those poor souls are wandering in the paths of darkness and deceit, of disorder and confusion, for want of any assistance that might be afforded them by your grace's pastoral endeavours.

Far be the presumption from me of pointing out to your grace, the means by which these endeavours ought first of all to be exerted. If your grace's sentiments accord with mine in any degree, the necessity of exerting them by some means will appear indispensible, and will not easily be superseded by the prospect of such difficulties, as all attempts of this nature must be attended with, let them be made when or by whom they will.

It is the general sense of mankind, my lord, that your grace's hands would not be strengthened in an undertaking of this kind by your brethren on the venerable bench; at least, it is believed, that your grace would not have the concurrence of a majority of them. The reasons on which such conjectures are grounded have been in part explained above. In so delicate an affair I presume not to interpose my own judgment, farther than to say, that an opposition to any thing your grace thinks fit to attempt for the service of true religion,

must be raised and managed to great disadvantage in the eye of the public. Whatever plausible topics might be offered in favour of the present establishment, it would be hard to persuade the thinking part or the world, that men, who very probably have prospects of rising higher, which might be intercepted by a reformation, are so much in earnest as your grace, who can have no such prospect, who rose to your present honours without any solicitation on your grace's part, and, as most people are convinced, not without reluctance.

It is believed, nay it is certainly known, that your grace's weight and influence is much greater where, in an enterprize of this nature, it might most happily be employed. All our english records afford not an example of a prince, who has been so tender of the religious liberties of his people as our present most gracious king. And though this, and other blessings of his righteous government, may have been abused by an ungrateful, unthinking, dissipated people, rendered wanton by a surfeit of temporal ease and prosperity, yet if one thing should still be found wanting to ease the consciences of a serious and useful part of his majesty's subjects, and which, being supplied, might contribute to the amendment of thousands neither so serious nor so useful;—is there a possibility that a case of this nature should find no compassion in the royal heart? Is there a man in the world so proper, so every way qualified to recommend it to that compassion as your grace? Is there a wise or a good man in the kingdom who could be disaffected or inattentive to a cause so espoused, and so recom-

mended besides, by its own unspeakable importance?

Permit me, my lord, on this occasion to refer your grace to an anecdote communicated to the world by a late free and impartial considerer of the *Free and candid disquisitions*, who is now pretty well known to be the reverend Mr. White.

"I have been credibly informed, says this "gentleman, he [his present majesty] has "sometimes said to a late great prelate, when "paying his duty at court;—*is there any "thing, my lord, you would have me do for the "church of England? If there is, let me know "it.*."*

Who this great prelate was, or what answer he returned to his majesty's most gracious motion, Mr. White sayeth not. He was wise. That answer (for it is absurd to think that no answer at all was returned) might open a door for reflexions extremely prejudicial to the cause Mr. White had in hand. In the mean time Mr. White had a use for his majesty's motion, more to his purpose than the prelate's answer most probably would have been.

For thus he goes on.—"And he who of his "own motion will say this, cannot receive "otherwise than graciously, any petition for "leave and opportunity to his clergy to con-"sult together for *its* good, if it be made with "decency and propriety."

Mr. White, when he said this, I believe, was persuaded that the clergy never would petition his majesty for any such leave; and the

* Free and Impartial Considerations, p. 56. Edit. 1751.

whole drift of his pamphlet is, not to bring a review into convocation, but to keep it out of parliament. His disingenuity is too visible to be covered by his affected concessions. His argument in twenty places plainly implies, that the humor of the people would not admit of alterations from any body of men; in which I believe he is very much mistaken.

But let *us* likewise make *our* use of this anecdote in our turn. His majesty is ready to do every thing necessary for the good and welfare of the church of England. Nothing can be better for the church of England, than that her forms of worship should be pure and evangelical; her discipline free from corruption, partiality and hypocrisy; her pastors, sober, vigilant, faithful, laborious, abstracted from worldly interests and pleasures, free from secular connexions as much as may be, and ornaments to, and examples of, the gospel they preach to the people. Was the church of England in full enjoyment of these blessings, when this question was put by the father of his people to this prelate? I will venture to answer at my own peril, she was not. She is not yet. Had not his majesty reason to expect a true and faithful account of so important a case? Why then was not the truth disclosed to his majesty freely and honestly? Why have we seen none of the beneficial consequences which might have been expected if the truth had been told? Let that great prelate answer for himself at the great day of account?—And be it not forgot by your grace, that the place occupied by that prelate is now filled by your grace, and that your

grace is or may be in his situation, with respect to the opportunity referred to by Mr. White, every time your grace pays your duty at court.

It is true the general opinion is, that the present ministry, if they would not oppose a review of our church affairs, would not encourage it. The reason of this Mr. White (perhaps inadvertently) hath given us. They think *the convocation is not to be trusted; they will embroil us.* And I believe their apprehensions are just. The greatest adversaries of a review are the dignified and opulent clergy, who of course have a great majority of the rest in their dependence. Of these the convocation is composed, and should the ministry be prevailed with (which I hope they never will, while the convocation is thus composed) to refer a review to that body, the members of it would certainly load the design with all the envy and clamour of the jew-bill, and might easily find the means of doing it without appearing to be at all concerned in it themselves.

But then the sting may easily be taken out of this objection, and the ministry effectually cured of these apprehensions, by your grace's appearing cordially and steadily at the head of this great work. In that case your grace would find a number of the english clergy, as respectable for their piety, probity and learning as any set of men in Europe, openly and avowedly declaring for the same cause. Men who are now brow-beaten and kept under by their diocesans, wherever they give room to suspect what their true principles are, and who therefore are obliged to mourn in secret for the ma-

ladies they cannot cure. Add to this, my lord, the veneration the laity must naturally have for an eminent prelate, whom they see boldly incurring the displeasure and detaching himself from the support of strong and numerous alliances, for the sake of truth and liberty, and the real interests of religion.—A veneration which must probably render a ministry, or even a parliament, unpopular, who should shew any disaffection, or appear to give any obstruction to your grace's honest and righteous endeavours.

But whatever grounds there may be for these conjectures, (and indeed conjectures they are and no more with respect to the body of the people, for whose inclinations, prejudices and humours no man can presume to answer from day to day) as things are now circumstanced in the church, your grace can by no means think of delivering your own soul, without an attempt to have them set right and corrected. I do not mean such a faint and feeble attempt, as might perhaps give occasion to bury the cause for ages to come, such an attempt as might serve just to save appearances and disculpate your grace in the eye of human prudence; but a zealous and vigorous attempt, proportioned to the many grievances and scandals which call so loudly for redress and correction.—In one word, such an attempt, whatever may be the hazards and mortifications that attend it, or whatever the event in which it may end, as will enable your grace to give a joyful and comfortable account of the high and important charge committed to your grace

by the all-seeing God and his Christ, at that awful period, when the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open, and every man receive according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good, or whether they be evil.

And now, my lord, it will not be surprising, should your grace be curious to know the name and station of this free and importunate remonstrant, both which should immediately be communicated to your grace, if the knowledge of them could be supposed to contribute in the least degree to the accomplishment, of what he has been so earnestly pleading for. But as the circumstances of the writer of these papers, sets him at as great a distance from your grace as, in a gradual subordination, the highest is from the lowest, if his arguments deserve no consideration for their own sake, they can derive no respect from his name or character.

The man himself, my lord, is a serious christian, hastening, in the decline of life, to put off all his moral connexions, not without eagerly wishing to see, ere he depart hence, some provision made for the succession of a more rational and righteous generation of his countrymen, than he fears the next will prove, without it.

In the course of these reflexions, the miserable state of the church, and your grace's influence towards the amendment of it, could not escape his notice, though he had a notion that possibly neither of them might be so obvious to your grace.—Pity, he thought, the one should continue to be estimated by no other measure than the false, partial, evasive

and perjurious returns that are made to visitation-books; or the idea of the other lessened by chimerical difficulties, raised and magnified by those who are perhaps afraid of nothing so much as to see your grace shine forth in a province, where, though your grace might not have so many of their compliments and adulations, your grace would both have and deserve true honour, esteem and reverence from much better men: and if by a hint of all this, your grace might be prevailed with to try your strength in this field of true glory, he thought it were even a sin not to give it, though no other conveyance could be found for it than the meanest hand in the kingdom.

These are the considerations which gave conception and birth to these papers; upon which the writer implores the blessing of Almighty God, having nothing in view but his glory, the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and consequently an increase of virtue and happiness among mankind. If he is in the wrong, it is not what he intends, and therefore can be no great loser by his mistake, being led into it by some of the plainest and clearest documents in the new testament. On the other hand, if that book contains the rule of christian life, he must be in the right, and in that case assures himself these papers, slight as they are, and whatever reception they may meet with from your grace, shall not utterly perish. They may be consumed in the flames, rot in the dust, or be rendered unlegible by the moths, yet will the time come when they shall be raised from this state of obscurity and oblivion, and admitted to bear their testimony,

when and where it will be no objection to them that they were addressed to the first prelate in England, by,

My lord,

Your grace's dutiful son

and humble servant,

A PRIVATE CLERGYMAN.

Nov. 8, 1754.

AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

AUTHORS

Of a BOOK, intitled,

FREE and CANDID DISQUISITIONS

Relating to the

CHURCH of ENGLAND, &c.

WHEREIN

The Contents of the FIRST LETTER of REMARKS on that Treatise, by a Presbyter of the Church of England, are particularly examined.

——*Contempto ordine rerum, omissa modestia ac pudore verborum ipsis etiam quibus utitur armis incompositus, et studio feriendi plerumque detectus, non* pugnat *sed* rixatur. INCERTI AUCTORIS in Dialogo de Oratoribus.

Little is it of avail to object, that such words are become unintelligible. Since they are truly english, men ought to understand them; and such as are for uniformity, should think all alterations in a language, strange, abominable, and unwarrantable.

DUNCIAD.

[FIRST PRINTED, MDCC L.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE judicious reader of the *Free and Candid Disquisitions*, and of the *Remarks* here examined, need not be told, that the latter are of that sort, which the authors of the former never intended to answer. Accordingly, the notice taken of them in the *Postscript to an Appeal to common reason and candor, in behalf of a review*, lately published, is little more than a repetition of their just sense of such kind of performances. It will be farther observed, that this apologist hath neither the parts nor the patience of the authors whom he undertakes to defend; he thinks a lower degree of both may serve to animadvert on a writer who hath shewn so little judgment or moderation. These circumstances, the said apologist hopes, will sufficiently acquit the excellent authors above-mentioned of all suspicion of any participation in this apology; and therefore he hath only farther to say on his own word, that these papers were drawn up, and are now printed, without the consent or knowledge of any one

concerned in the *Disquisitions :* and that for two reasons; 1. The apologist knew not how to apply to them, having never (to his knowledge) spoken to, or seen a disquisitor in his life; and, living at a very great distance from London, or any other place where literary news is current, he does not know, to this hour, who they are that have the reputation of writing or compiling the said disquisitions.

2. Had he been ever so solicitous to have the countenance of those worthy men, yet, as he thinks them very sincere in all their declarations, he was and is very apprehensive, that his present undertaking would have had no encouragement from that quarter. He is not however alone in his opinion, that these remarks, frivolous as they are, should not appear in public unattended with a particular comment; for the sake of such as are apt to be astonished with that kind of outcry wherewith they abound; and not for their sake only, but for the sake also of those excellent persons, to whom every good christian is so highly indebted for the endeavours they have used towards the reformation we so very much want; and for whom it is but decent that somebody should say, with becoming freedom, what their prudence and modesty restrain them from saying for themselves.

AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

AUTHORS

Of a BOOK, intitled,

FREE and CANDID DISQUISITIONS

Relating to the

CHURCH of ENGLAND, &c.

THE Reverend Presbyter, who gives occasion to this apology, opens with a very tragical state of the case: he will have it, that the publication of the "*Disquisitions* may affect the honour and interest of our church, "and be attended with the most pernicious "consequences;" and he represents this work "(Page 5.) as having a manifest tendency to "unsettle the minds, and debauch the princi- "ples of the people, and to give them a con- "temptible notion of our constitution."

It is to be observed, that the book, of which the remarker gives this character, was, in the winter 1746, lodged in the hands of a very eminent and worthy prelate in manuscript; that when it was thought proper to print it, it was, in the most respectful terms, dedicated to our governors in every rank and distinction of

church and state, and to the convocation of both provinces; that it hath already passed through two editions, and is said to be as ready for a third, as any other performance of this last age; and that, in all this time, we have not had the least warning from our governors, or from any one by their direction, of the pernicious consequences and tendencies suggested by the remarker, which however (if the surmise hath any real foundation) it was but reasonable to expect.

I do not pretend, that these circumstances ought to exempt the *Free* and *Candid Disquisitions* from the remarks of a private hand: the authors, it is plain, desire no such privilege for themselves; but this I will say, that, in these circumstances, a private man of common prudence would be well assured, that he should take the lead, in a controversy of this nature, with great advantages of argument; the rather as the farther he should go in laying open the tendencies and consequences charged upon the disquisitions, the more he would detract from the penetration, or, what is worse, from the care and vigilance of his superiors. This surely deserved some of our remarker's consideration; and, to do him justice, there is a presumption that he bestowed some little upon it.

His advertisement we had in December: his pamphlet, of no more than 79 pages, comes not out till March: part of this interval, then, we may fairly allot to conferences with his friends, concerning the propriety of his undertaking.

If it were easy to come at the worthy dignitary of Wells, to whom these remarks are

addressed; and who, without doubt, was consulted about the publication of them; one might possibly learn some particulars relative to the conception and birth of this pamphlet, well worth knowing.

He might be asked, for example, whether he importuned this gentleman for his sentiments on the Disquisitions? Whether, by such importunity, he extorted a promise from the remarker, to give him those sentiments in writing? Is it not a little uncommon, that a man should beg leave to be as good as his word of the very person, who in all reason should be in some degree concerned to have the word kept?

This worthy dignitary might be farther entreated to say, whether, having some notion of what kind these sentiments might be, he did not civilly insinuate to the remarker, that the trouble of writing them down might as well be spared? The remarker says, "He is not "insensible of his inabilities to remark pro-"perly." This could hardly be the suggestion of his own heart, who, in the prosecution of his design, remarks and considers objections, with as little feeling of his own insufficiency, as if there was no such thing in nature. Might not these inabilities have been tenderly hinted to him in a friendly and polite circumlocution? —And who so likely to give the hint as the judicious friend, who had an opportunity of hearing the sentiments before they were down upon paper? "I am in hopes (says he) you "will not blame me, for presuming to meddle "with a debate which so nearly concerns us."

Consider this passage well, and say whether this conjecture is wholly without foundation.

If the sentiments were not approved in the utterance, much less were they likely to please in black and white; no prudent man would care to be of the party (even in a title-page) with a writer who gives the following account of his work.—"If our governors shall think fit "utterly to disregard them [the *Disquisitions*]; "yet I hnmbly conceive it will be necessary, "that they should be thoroughly considered, "and fairly stated and represented to the "people; and that the people should be pro- "perly cautioned and guarded against an at- "tempt which hath a manifest tendency to "debauch their principles, &c." Without all peradventure, if the attempt be as it is here set forth, the necessity for considering, stating, and representing it, is quite indispensable; but what, in the mean time, must be thought of the disregard of our governors, while all this is doing by a private and un-authorized hand?

In giving the reason why it is more especially necessary for him to turn guardian on this pressing occasion, the remarker is more spirited still. "The members of our church (says "he) in general were perhaps never at any "time since the reformation less able to give "an answer to the objections made to our li- "turgy than they are at present."—What should be the meaning of this? The matter of fact on another hand is, that arts and sciences, and good letters, have been, within the period he assigns, in a constant progression from worse to better: multitudes of old errors

have been exploded, and the smoke of prejudice they have left behind gradually dispersed: much of the rubbish which had overlaid many useful and valuable truths, liberty, day-light, and industry, have removed; and strange it would be, if religious knowledge did not keep pace in some degree with improvements in other things: the conclusion, therefore, naturally deducible from these premises, laid together, seems to be, that these objections to the liturgy are found to be more reasonable than heretofore they were esteemed; and that the ingenuous churchman is become less able to defend the liturgy in all points, in proportion as he discovers in it circumstances less suitable to the present demands of the christian church.

This would be talking common sense; but then it would be talking like the authors of the Disquisitions too: some other account, therefore, must be given of this inability in our churchmen; and here it is, viz. *A long disuse of their arms.* "The members of our "church have been cautious of meddling with "controversial points, or giving the least of-"fence to those who separate from us." Is this then a fault? Yes, surely: "For they "ought to have considered these objections, "and preached upon the design, the connex-"ion and beauty, of the liturgy." And whose fault was it they did not? Why, "they for-"bore in obedience to the directions of their "superiors." A fine account both of our bishops and clergy!

But is not this account a little too late for the fact?—If I am not much mistaken, there is one member of our church, the Rev. Mr.

White, whom our remarker will not allow to have been disabled for want of *handling his arms*: it is no long time since this gentleman declared "he had succeeded beyond his ex-"pectation in reviving a controversy which "had lain long neglected;" nor can we suppose him to have been under any restrictive directions, since he says this to a prelate, "whose orthodoxy, and zealous attachment "to that excellent constitution which he hath "undertaken to defend, is every where spoken "of, and applauded."* And it is well known, that in this warfare Mr. White hath been accompanied and followed by others who have at least betrayed no want of dexterity.

Suppose now the remarker's superiors might not think his undertaking so useful or so pertinent as Mr. White's? Suppose they did not look upon the authors of the disquisitions in the light of dissenters? Or, lastly, suppose it may have been found by the event, that Mr. White's way of reviving the controversy with the dissenters, viz. by recrimination†, hath

* Dedication to three letters, &c. 1748. p. iv. v.

† Vid. *Expoſition of the orthodox ſyſtem of civil rights and church-power*, &c. p. 83.—Upon occaſion of citing this ingenious and accurate performance, it may not be unſeaſonable to query, whether it be worth the while to revive our diſputes with the proteſtant diſſenters on any point, or in any way? When writers of the firſt name and character in our eſtabliſhment differ among themſelves about the baſis of ſo capital an article in it as a teſt-law, without doubt the complainers and oppoſers of ſuch laws will enjoy the controverſy with much comfort to themſelves, and not without advantage to their cauſe. Inſtead therefore of inventing theories to juſtify teſt-laws in the abſtract, or to perpetuate them on the indefeaſible bottom of right (concerning which there muſt be, in the nature of the thing, eternal ſquabbles) were it not better to reſt the whole matter on the actual exigencies of thoſe ſocieties where ſuch laws are found; which

not redounded so much to the peace and honour of the church, as to Mr. White's own reputation? Would not any of this serve to account for the silence of able men on the ſubject of the Diſquiſitions, as well as the very aukward ſuppoſition, that the members of our church in general are leſs able in this province than in any other?

The remarker, however, is determined to pin himſelf and his cauſe upon his governors, if he poſſibly can: if they will not admit him to bear a part of their burden, he is reſolved they ſhall bear a part of his; and thus he contrives it.

The authors of the *Diſquiſitions* had ſaid, that they expected no oppoſition but from "men "of zeal without knowledge," or of "much "reading without equal judgment." Now the remarker's ſpirits beginning to flag towards the cloſe of his letter, he had leiſure to look back; and, perceiving that, not inſenſible of his inabilities, he had given occaſion to ſurmiſe, that it might be his mere concern for the

admitting occaſionally of relaxation, or even of repeal, as ſuch exigencies appear to vary or decreaſe, will give teſt-laws the ſolid and unexceptionable foundation of other righteous laws—THE GOOD OF THE WHOLE, ALL CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDERED; and this, coinciding with the grand ſcheme of chriſtianity, will alſo afford a defence of teſt-laws (ſuch of them, I mean, as deſerve to be defended at all) on chriſtian principles: a ſort of defence which I humbly conceive is not to be had for any excluſive terms of church-communion that are indiſpenſably and neceſſarily interwoven with the contexture of our conſtitution, as I take the caſe to be where original contracts and alliances are pre-ſuppoſed. And if matters ſucceed ſo ill in this prime queſtion, debates upon leſſer points will edify ſtill leſs.

cause, that pressed him into this debate, he saw this unlucky prophecy, of "zeal without "knowledge," pointing full at his devoted head; and therefore, hastily picking up the disregard he had before stigmatized, shifting its habit, and introducing it into convocation and parliament, in the similitude of opposition, he decently and dexterously brings in his governors for a share in the compliment; which is humbly offered as a specimen of the remarker's modesty.

Having conducted the remarker into his province, let us next observe, how he acquits himself in it. "He can easily imagine (page "5.) that our liturgy may admit of some little "amendments and improvements." The value of this concession we may find leisure to estimate hereafter. In the mean time he represents our liturgy as "enriched with the "most devout and unexceptionable parts of "antient liturgies—purged of all superstitious "usages and corruptions of later ages—adorned "with the most beautiful simplicity and pro- "priety of diction—and, in short, wanting "words to express his admiration, and capa- "city to represent its design, connexion, and "devout nature, in a proper manner, he is at "long-run reduced to borrow language of an "eminent writer (page 48.) to inform us, that "the church is not wilfully conscious of any "imperfections in her service, neither can "others prove any upon her." Where now will he find room for his little amendments and improvements even in his own imagination?

It hath ever been the opinion of judicious and sober-minded apologists for the church of

England, that the circumstances of the times, and the views of particular persons, would not allow our reformers to proceed in correcting errors, and supplying defects, as far as they would have done, or as the nature of this work would otherwise have suggested. On the contrary, positive is our remarker, that our worthy and pious reformers left nothing short; but took care to "purge the liturgy of all the su- "perstitious usages and corruptions of later "ages, and to adorn it with the most beauti- "ful simplicity and propriety of diction." Would not one expect from this account, that every thing was done by our worthy and pious reformers with the spirit and purity that St. Paul himself would have set things in order?

I will not mortify him so much as to refer him back to the Disquisitions, which he pretends to have perused with care; but will desire him only to take archbishop Laud's word on this occasion, a witness above all suspicion of taking part with jesuits, heretics, or schismatics, of any denomination.

This learned prelate, to solve the wonder how this great alteration [the reformation under queen Elizabeth] could so suddenly be made, and that by a woman, brings seven reasons; the 4th, 5th, and 7th of which are in these words: "4. To take all scruple out of "the heads of the people, and that they might "not conceive any great alteration in the re- "ligion or service of the church, the altera- "tion was framed as near the old as could be. "5. The title and jurisdiction of bishops (with "some little grace and authority) was conti-

" nued; and they permitted the use of the sur-
" plice, ceremonies, anthems, organs, and
" many prayers in the same form the old were.
" Lastly, the instrumental causes, and chief ar-
" tificers of this building were choice men of
" learning, wisdom, experience, and policy;
" as viz. Sir William Cecyll, Sir Nicholas
" Bacon, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, Sir Tho-
" mas Smith, &c."*

Some things then were permitted, not because right in themselves, but to take all scruple out of the heads of the people: and is the remarker sure, that among these there was no usage, which would not have been permitted, but for this single reason?

The historians of those times, one and all, have observed, that Queen Elizabeth was desirous to keep the papists in temper, as well as to gratify the protestants: with this view a petition, to be delivered from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, was left out of the litany; and the first clauses of the two forms, at the delivery of the elements in the communion-service, which, as favouring transubstantiation, had been left out of King Edward's second liturgy (composed by a very different sort of artificers†) were

* Dr. Nicholls's ſupplement, Page 10. of archbiſhop Laud's introduction, &c.

† Viz. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, &c. Men whoſe piety had at leaſt a lower alloy of policy in it. By the way, here was a dead weight upon popery, hung on by ſome of our great churchmen, at the reformation, and afterwards taken off by ſtate-artificers among the laity: was this a circumſtance not worth remembering by a late ingenious author of—An enquiry into the behaviour of our great church-

re-inserted. This, we are told, had its effect; that is, it brought numbers of papists to church; and so long as that continued to be the case, it was politic to retain those clauses: but if those, and some other clauses, sounding the same way, should, in this age, be found to have just the contrary effect, where would be either the policy or the piety of retaining them now?

But grant the remarker his fact, viz. "that "our liturgy was thus accurately purged and "adorned by our reformers," and what will be the consequence? Will he say the beauty of it has been since defaced? Or does the honest man think, that the liturgy he reads in his church at———— is for diction, simplicity, connection, &c. just as it came out of the hands of the reformers? If he will take no matter of fact of this sort, on the testimony of men, who in his opinion, have laboured to bring our constitution into contempt; yet in preparing his remarks, it should seem quite necessary for him to have made some acquain-

since the reformation, &c.—It is true, these bishops fall not within the period from which he sets out, nor, he may say, within his design, inasmuch as they had no puritans to practise upon: but surely that period was just as the enquirer pleased to make it: and in a book with such a title, could he fairly omit to mention, that, but for some great churchmen, there very probably had been no reformation at all?—Would the stripes inflicted upon their successors have been less real, or less poignant, for his doing this justice to our primitive reformers? Or is it possible, so sensible a writer, should not be able to rid himself of the mean prejudice, that a man, with the appellation of bishop, can do nothing right? He cannot but know, that what he says even of Queen Elizabeth's bishops, is by no means true of them all: and is true, perhaps, as he says it, but of a very few of them.

tance with such of our ritualists as meant at least to do honour to the liturgy, by their histories, comments, and defences: some of these surely speak of a review and alterations, in King Charles the second's reign.

May his ignorance here be affected? Or may his zeal have been only a little too forward for his memory? I cannot tell; let the reader judge; for in these very words, I do assure him, is the paragraph concluded: "Was I capable of representing the design, "the connection and devout nature of it [the "liturgy] in a proper manner; was I capable "of considering the objections which are made "to it, as they ought to be considered, I "fancy the learned authors of the Disquisitions "would have no great cause to triumph. A "work of this kind, done by an able hand, "could not fail to do great credit to our "church, and be of infinite service to our "people." Could this be penned by the "hand of any man who had ever heard of the works, or even of the names of Comber, Nicholls, Bennet, Wheatley, Bisse, &c. &c. &c.? Or was there not one among them all capable of setting off the liturgy, or of considering objections to the remarker's mind?

So much for the remarker's knowledge in antiquity? what follows is a taste of his candour.

There is a certain popular topic that seldom escapes the notice of serious writers in religious or political debate, whatever sect, party, or opinion they espouse; and has by turns been enlisted into the service of them all. And that is the corruption and degeneracy of the age and

country wherein we live. But forasmuch as the simple fact is not of itself more favourable to one side than another, the advantage they severally make of it arises from their account of its origin and progress, which therefore they mark and trace with great precision.

The deist ascribes it to a departure from the rule of right reason, and the fitness of things; and thereupon represents it as growing from bad to worse, ever since the first plantation of the gospel in this island. The Arian is positive, that it is coæval with what he calls the Athanasian heresy, and has been bred and nourished through all the intermediate ages along with that. The papist assures us, it is wholly owing to the want of a true church, and dates its rise from the reformation. The presbyterian thinks it arose from the formality of a lifeless and ceremonious book-service, and registers its birth on Bartholomew-day 1662. The Jacobite is very sure it came in with King William, and never will be out till the line of Stuarts be restored. The Quakers, Methdists, &c. assign each a several æra of its origin, and a different method of its propagation. The writers of the church of England, as distinguished from the rest, are indeed in different opinions about the time of its nativity, and the degrees of its growth; or rather not very positive in their accounts of either; but most of them seem to think it has been some ages in coming to its present bulk. And I presume the reason why they are not more decisive in this matter, may be, that as greater numbers are attached to their establishment, they perceive, that in proportion, they have a larger

quantity of this corruption among themselves. They are therefore contented to ascribe its nutrition to infidelity, popery, heresy, quakerism, presbytery, &c. to the toleration and mixture of various sects and opinions, to which the liberty of our country gives access and encouragement, without descending to farther particulars.

Our remarker, in his turn, hath not failed to observe, that "the nation is sunk into hor-"rid degeneracy, into the dregs of impiety "and licentiousness." Which I fear is very true, as indeed it would be surprising, that a fact, in which all sides and parties are agreed, should not.

But what is extraordinary, and indeed peculiar to his account of this matter, is the modern date he assigns to the introduction of this impiety and licentiousness: he seems to think it is but in its sixteenth year, and hath marked for its birth-day that on which the first of the dissenters late sermons against popery was preached at Salter's hall, which was, as I remember, about the beginning of the year 1735, and his method of deducing this genealogy is so curious, that it well deserves to be recorded.

"(1.) These dissenters preached and pub-"lished the most unjust insinuations against "the government and worship of the church "of England; the consequence of which has "been, that——(2.) The professed enemies of "our religion, encouraged by the example of "protestants, and pretended friends, have "taken still greater liberties, and pursued us "with the utmost malice and bitterness. "(3.) There is scarce a libel upon christianity,

" which hath been lately published by infidels,
" jesuits, or heretics, of any denomination,
" but what has been stuffed with invectives
" against the established church, and with
" notions and opinions which have a direct
" tendency to corrupt the principles of its
" members. (4.) Thus pernicious tares were
" sown among the wheat——(5.) The people's
" minds being thus filled and perplexed with
" doubts and difficulties, their zeal for religion,
" and the public devotions, has gradually
" abated. (6.) High and low, rich and poor,
" are now evidently infected with an amazing
" looseness of principles; with an irreligious
" indifference towards the worship or commu-
" nion of any assembly of christians whatso-
" ever; and so (7.) we arrive at the dregs and
" degeneracy aforesaid."

The remarker must pardon me, if I subscribe not to this account, having read in some authentic histories, that there was great plenty of infidel, jesuitical, heretical principles and opinions, many wicked devices, and much irreligious practice in this our island, before the period assigned by him; which, I think, this remarker might fix upon, the rather on account of its use in his present undertaking (of which by-and-bye) than for the sake of any truth there is in it.

In the mean time be it remembered, that so far as this charge upon the dissenters, viz. of reflecting upon the government and worship of the church of England, or any part of it, is true, I praise them not for it; and am very ready to own, that some of their best writers have taken more and greater liberties of this

kind when and where they had no provocations, than became so wise and good men.

Indeed any petulant strictures on the church of England, true or false, will make but an aukward figure in a collection of discourses, the authors of some of which are so much obliged to the principal writers of that church for the best things in them. And obliged too for a great deal more than they have thought fit to acknowledge.

But then this is all that these premises will bear; and, for aught that ever I have seen, all the other invectives against the church of England would have stood where they do, and as they do; and all the impiety and irreligion among us (whether the consequence of these invectives or not) would have been just what they are, though not one of these discourses at Salter's hall, &c. had been either published or preached.

What colour then for this parade of consequences? No colour at all, but great and pressing occasion for it: without a deduction of this sort, the remarker could have made out no connexion between the authors of the Disquisitions, and the dissenters—A connexion too favourable to his views to be left for the simple-minded reader to collect by his own sagacity. But having brought in the Disquisitions at this unhappy conjuncture, the zealous churchman is no longer at a loss where to father the book; it is, you see, the natural issue of the plot laid at Salter's hall.

For my own part, I will not scruple to own myself so much of an heretic, as not to be very solicitous whether the dissenters, the authors

of the Disquisitions, or any other sort of people, contrive the scheme, provided any scheme is but contrived that will effectually root up this train of evils enumerated by the remarker, by restoring the gospel of Christ to its true and genuine influence upon the minds and manners of our people.

I plainly see in the *Free and Candid Disquisitions* an aim at this good end; and I am not a little surprised the remarker should not see it too, considering how he hath stated the case.

It is very clear, that throughout this whole detail the remarker hath preserved his consciousness, that the great prevalence of this corruption and degeneracy is among the nominal members of our own establishment. Let me ask him then, is it for the honour or credit of the church of England, in her present circumstances, to complain of this corruption and degeneracy at all?

To complain of what is simply and in itself incurable, is frivolous and childish: to complain, and to repeat our complaints from age to age, of what is curable, and of which we have the remedies in our hands, is the way to be despised and laughed at—

—Uti mox
Nulla fides damnis verisque doloribus adsit.

The former, I suppose, nobody will believe to be the case with us; and in the other circumstances, what room can the church of England have for complaint? Are not her members in possession of the whole civil and ecclesiastical power of the nation? And may not the church, by their means, apply it to the

remedy of all her grievances with the greatest ease, expedition, and advantage?

Why so many fruitless complaints of the mischief that infidels, heretics, jesuits, dissenters, &c. do to the religion and morals of England, since these people all of them owe, not only the undue liberties they may take, but their very subsistence on english ground, to the favour and indulgence of the church of England, and her sons? And should any of them be found corrupting either the principles or the manners of our people, I humbly conceive that no title to toleration could be extended to the impunity of crimes of that nature; and surely such crimes are capable of the plainest proof.

In the mean time the matter of fact is, that infidelity, impiety, and iniquity of all sorts, do greatly flourish and abound: all men see it, and all serious men confess and complain of it. And whether it is, that the church of England doth not apply the remedies and means she has in her power; or whether it is, that, as a church, she really wants these means and remedies, or the power and opportunity to apply them; what we know for certain is, that all her present endeavours to stem the torrent are ineffectual.

In this state of things the authors of the *Free* and *Candid Disquisitions* offer a new expedient; and of the two suppositions abovementioned, have chosen, if not the more reasonable, at least the more respectful. Instead of charging their governors with a neglect of duty in not applying the means of reformation already in their hands (which, by the general run of reformers of our own communion, hath

been more than obliquely insinuated) they have supposed the grand defect may be in the constitution of the church; for which our present governors are not answerable, as having had no hand in the framing of it; and concerning which too, as any one may perceive, a reform will be attended with many more difficulties, and beset with many more prejudices, than where the means of edification, already provided, and supposed to be unexceptionably good, only want to be carried into execution.

Their reasons for thus supposing they bring from the nature of the case, plain matters of fact, and the tenor of the gospel, independent of the prejudices and objections of men of other communions; they hope this may be a proper time for considerations of this sort; and only desire their propesals and suggestions may have (what they may certainly have, without just offence to any party of men whatever) a fair examination. After which the issue is, with all duty and acquiescence on their part, submitted to their governors.

In this point of view the authors of the disquisitions appear to be true friends and faithful allies to the church of England, and their work a labour of love, and a very probable corrective of the corruption by which she suffers so much, and which (in this light) she hath so much reason to lament: and though the remarker, as I hinted above, did not or would not see all this himself; yet, by the measures he hath taken, it appears he was apprehensive, that others would be likely to see it; and therefore, to abate the favour and good-will which

this friendly and benevolent aspect of the book, and of the men who compiled it, would naturally bespeak in the minds of all serious, sensible, and dispassionate readers, he hath done, what indeed many a remarker and answerer hath done before him, in the way of trade; viz. the first thing that seemed good for the present distress.

In plain terms, he hath advanced a black and base calumny, which, to prevent mistakes, is here set down in his own words. "At this "unhappy conjuncture (says he) a treatise is "published by men who profess themselves of "our communion, complaining of as great "defects in our reformation, our liturgy, in "our discipline, and every part of our religi-"ous establishment, as ever were PERHAPS "suggested by papists, heretics, enthusiasts, "or the most inveterate enemies of our con-"stitution."

PERHAPS, quoth he! Are these accusations of a sort to be thrown out at a venture? What defects the authors of the *Disquisitions* have complained of, this remarker hath carefully perused; and therefore, in this member of his comparison, he cannot have the aid of his perhaps: will he then plead his ignorance of the defects that papists, heretics, and enthusiasts, have objected to our church? Doth he not know, that the papist, having first stript the church of England of her apostolical succession, hath inferred from thence the absolute nullity of our orders, sacraments, and all our ministrations? Hath he never heard of heretics, who have charged upon our creeds, invocations, and doxologies, a multiplication of

Gods? Hath he no books to inform him, that the sign of the cross hath been called by enthusiasts, popish superstition, and kneeling at the communion, downright idolatry?

I have by accident a little book at hand, which exhibits and professes to answer some objections to our church-catechism: upon opening it, the very first that occurs is put down in these words; "The use of godfathers "and godmothers is unwarrantable, and the "name profane, as being a breach of the third "commandment." Can a clergyman, a presbyter of the church of England, a zealous writer in defence of it, decently profess his ignorance of all this? Or can this remarker match these and a thousand other extravagancies, with any the most distant insinuations in the *Free* and *candid Disquisitions?*

But the man is certainly wise in his generation: who knows where a review may end? Our governors may take it into their heads to look over their antient canons, and substitute some of those in the room of others less edifying, useful or effectual; and perhaps that of the council of Mascon: "Concerning those "who are convicted of accusing the innocent; "if he be a more honourable clerk, let him be "degraded from the order of his office; if only "a secular, let him be deprived of the commu-"nion."

In the present state of theological controversy, this might not be thought an idle provision; and to the introduction of it (a reformation once on foot) the remarker, on his principles of "antient" and "primitive", could have no objection, since it is by one pontificate more

primitive than the sacramentary of Gregory the great, to which we are beholden for so much of our liturgy. And, were a canon to this effect now in full force, would it be sufficient for the slanderer to wipe his mouth, and come with his female cant, "with what design "this is done I am unwilling to guess, and "shall not presume to say?" Better is it then to prevent and obstruct all alterations whatever, and block up the way to a review, with whatever rubbish comes first to hand, than that this orthodox remarker should have his bouncing spirit cooped up within the limits of truth and charity, or fall under the unhappy alternative of losing the title of presbyter, to recommend his false wares at the market.

If it were possible for me to discover whether the remarker values himself more on his honesty, or his understanding, I would oblige him so far as to ascribe the next paragraph to his ignorance or his artifice, as he should chuse; but as I am out of the reach of intelligence of that sort, I will come as near him as I can, and suppose it to be a compound of both.

"Were our governors, says he, to make all "the alterations which the learned disquisitors "have thought necessary; were they to pay a "regard to several remarks which they have "suggested, I should not scruple to affirm, "that the beauty of our liturgy must unavoid-"ably be defaced, and an ecclesiastical estab-"lishment cease to be any part of our consti-"tution: there cannot, I think, be strictly "and properly an established church upon t' "plan proposed."

A reader of this passage, and of that class, who think they learn enough of any book by reading the remarks upon it, will, without doubt, conclude, that there is a precise and distinct plan of an established church, delineated in the Disquisitions; and that all the alterations, and all the several remarks mentioned in that book, are parts and members of such plan. It is indeed just possible, that some few other sort of readers, who have gone through the Disquisitions, may drudge on to this 8th page of the remarks, and thereupon regret their want of memory, as touching this same plan.

Be that as it will, certain it is, that in the Disquisitions no such plan is to be found.

The *Free and candid Disquisitions* are a collection of the sentiments of different persons, on the imperfection of our present ecclesiastical establishment: these are accordingly represented in different views, occasionally introduced, and without much connexion, or any artificial method; some opinions there recited are different on the very same point; some things are proposed to be corrected, and improved; others that are superfluous or defective, to be removed or supplied respectively; and this according to the hints the authors had received from their friends and acquaintance, which are commonly expressed in the very words of their correspondents: and so far are these authors from being decisive themselves, that the reader is warned, in some cases, not to expect their opinion at all; they are for leaving many things, liable to dispute, at liberty; in a

word, they determine nothing but that a review is really wanted; sketch out nothing, unless perhaps here and there a detached particular; submit every thing with the greatest modesty and deference to their governors, in whose decisions they declare over and over a readiness and resolution to acquiesce.

One of their proposals I shall particularly exhibit, for the sake of illustrating at once the design of these authors, and the spirit or capacity, which you will, of this remarker.

It is proposed (*Disquisitions*, page 200, &c.) that their "lordships the bishops should order "their archdeacons to send circular letters to "the clergy within their respective archdea-"conries, desiring each of them, at a visita-"tion therein fixed, to point out, and deliver "to the archdeacon, in writing (but sealed "up, and directed to the bishop of the dio-"cese), what things they judge most excep-"tionable, and, for good reasons, could wish "amended, either in our liturgy, or in rela-"tion to any other part of our ecclesiastical "establishment.—Which (observations and "reasons) being communicated by each of "their lordships, in a full assembly, and in the "manner, that shall by each be judged most "prudent, might afterwards be considered of "by them and the convocation.—What a "noble treasure," say these authors, "would "their lordships have then before them, re-"lating to every article of our constitution, "that may want to be improved or amended?" —So far are they from laying down the plan themselves!

Let us now suppose, that in consequence of

these orders to the archdeacons, the several packets of observations and reasons are returned to their lordships; that the seals are broke open before their lordships, and a select number of other divines, and the contents of them read one after another, by some person thereunto appointed.

This done, an antient and venerable presbyter stands up, and humbly advises their lordships to proceed no farther in this business. ——"Were your lordships," says he, "to make "all the alterations which the learned obser- "vators have thought necessary, were you to "pay a regard to several remarks which they "have suggested, I shall not scruple to affirm, "that the beauty of our liturgy must unavoid- "ably be defaced, and an ecclesiastical estab- "lishment cease to be any part of our consti- "tution. There cannot, I think, be strictly "and properly an established church upon the "plan proposed."

How the honest man, and his speech, would be answered, or rather how he would be stared at, without being answered at all, I leave to the imagination of those, who may have seen assemblies of sensible men (one or two such orators excepted) in the like circumstances: and do most freely and gratuitously present the remarker with this picture of his wisdom, or candor, or both; and for which too I pretend to his thanks, as it may (or in all reason should) save him the pains he intends to take, in shewing the consistent nature of the proposals offered by the authors of the *Free and candid Disquisitions.*

We are now happily arrived at the last page of this first letter:—The more happily, as it informs us, that by this time the remarker hath written himself into some degree of comfort, and begins to see day through all the gloom of consequences and tendencies, in which he set out; and that, "if ever a review should be "thought necessary, he is become not ap- "prehensive, that it would be attended with "consequences so very pernicious as some "good people (and he, good man, among the "rest) seem to imagine."

His hopes he rests on this, "that the present "learned prelates of our church cannot, in "decency and good manners, be supposed to "compliment heretics or schismatics at the "expence of fundamentals; or ever so much "as think of defacing the beauty of our litur- "gy, or throwing down fences, &c."

It is observable of those who are apt to take sudden frights at chimerical appearances, that they are occasionally as weak the other way, and build their joys and comforts on as airy foundations as their fears: thus it fares with our remarker; for how can he infer what may or may not ever be done from the dispositions and capacities of our present prelates? A review may be thought necessary when their heads are laid; and who knows what lengths their successors may go?—This impropriety was indeed hardly worth noting, had not the remarker, at the bottom of the foregoing page, said something of a design to consider the beauties of good writing, in a distinct letter, on the Disquisitions, designed for that purpose.

But let us take him as we can have him, and suppose him to mean,—If a review should be thought necessary during the presidency of our present prelates.—Well then, to what do his hopes amount? Exactly to this: "That, if "a review should be thought necessary, our "prelates would certainly leave things just as "they found them;" for indeed how else should they (disposed and qualified as he represents them to be) leave a church whose doctrines and worship are "remarkably pure "and primitive, and free from all kinds of "heretical opinions, and idolatrous practices?"

"The candid authors themselves (says he) "are pleased to admit, that the learned pre-"lates, who preside in our church, are every "way qualified to distinguish between what is "necessary to be altered, and what not." And will not the candid remarker be pleased to admit this as well as these candid authors? How then should they ever think it necessary to review, what is under no necessity at all to be reviewed?

But let us consider his hopes more particularly: "he hopes their lordships will never "compliment heretics or schismatics at the ex-"pence of fundamentals." It is to be wished the remarker had here told us precisely what he takes to be fundamentals; till we know this his expectations from the bishops cannot be determined.

The great Chillingworth, chap. III, sect. 13. thinks it enough in reason for protestants to say in general, "that it is sufficient for any "man's salvation to believe, that the scripture "is true, and contains all things necessary to

" salvation ; and to do his best endeavour " to find and believe the true sense of it ;" which is not unlikely to be the opinion of our learned prelates also ; forasmuch as something to the same purpose is the subject-matter of the VIth article of our church.

And since, as the same excellent writer hath observed, " a particular catalogue of funda- " mentals, equally suited to the circumstances " of all men, is not to be had," the alternative can only be, " that all is fundamental, and " not to be disbelieved under pain of damna- " tion, which the church hath defined."

Now as I am firmly persuaded, that their lordships the bishops would compliment no man or set of men upon earth, at the expence of the first of these propositions ; so am I also convinced, that great numbers of those, who may pass with the remarker for heretics and schismatics, would come into the church of England, without such a strain of their lordships courtesy.

If indeed the latter be our remarker's description of fundamentals, and consequently what he would modestly have us admit as the definition of our present prelates, I leave him to compute how many of those millions, for whose principles he is so anxious, the want of such a compliment would most certainly turn out of the church.

" He next hopes our governors will never " think of defacing the beauty of our liturgy." Here again we are uncertain whether our governors and the remarker are agreed concerning the particular traits of this beauty ; and if there is any difference on this article, I conceive our

remarker's manner of painting will bring but few of them over to his opinion. But as he may hereafter be met with on the particulars of his remarks on the disquisitions, let him for the present be left in the full enjoyment of his hopes on this head.

Lastly, he hopes they [the prelates of our church] will never think of throwing down fences, &c.—But why not rather hope, that they would think of making them up? For, if this remarker hath proved any one thing in this pamphlet, it is, that the present fences of the church are not sufficient either to keep in her friends, or to keep out her enemies.

On the one hand, "persons of all ranks, "high and low, rich and poor, are now infect-"ed with an amazing looseness of principles, "with an irreligious indifference, disposed to "hearken to the most impious, absurd, and "illiterate notions, which have a tendency to "vilify the worship, the creeds, the ministers, "the sacraments, of our church."

If this be true, what multitudes must have escaped over the pale, and be now dispersed and scattered abroad?

On the other hand, he talks, (p. 29.) of "impious and sceptical readers within the "church; of some amongst us, who, having "more than once subscribed to the liturgy, ap-"pear quite regardless of the most solemn sub-"scriptions, vows, and promises."

Is not this a representation loudly proclaiming the present ruinous condition of our fences, and an immediate necessity for all hands to work to repair them? Why then does not the

remarker bestow some of his clamour to turn the attention of his governors this way?

Alas! no. Any thing rather than repairs and alterations. The indefeasible principle of NO ALTERATIONS, is a fundamental that will support any thing; and give beauty and connexion to the absurdest and most barefaced contradictions.

Is it humbly suggested, that there may be a necessity for a review, from the supposed defects in our establishment? Then all is beautiful, orderly, and safe; "the fences of our "church strong and firm, her doctrines and "worship remarkably pure and primitive, and "free from all kinds of heretical opinions, and "superstitious practices." Can the pious christian wish for any thing more?

On another side, are the authors of the disquisitions to be opposed on the footing of mistiming their proposals? See what a miserable spectacle this beautiful, strong, and compact church of England becomes at once!—"Pernicious tares are sown among the wheat, among "the salutary principles and doctrines of our "church. Insomuch that it hath been difficult "to gather up the tares without rooting up the "wheat also. Amidst such a mixture of truth, "and impious, artful falsehoods, it has been "difficult for people of low education at least, "to distinguish between what is true religion, "and what are the corruptions of later ages; "between what is real piety, and what enthusiasm; between what is devotion, and what "superstition."—Can a more horrid picture of confusion and disorder in a christian church be imagined?

It is now time to take leave of this remarker for the present; and, to be as civil as we can at parting, it must be acknowledged, that he hath taken every topic into his declamation, which a rich common-place-book may be supposed to furnish under the word—church; nor hath he omitted those beauties of good writing, of which there are so many examples in the controversial pieces of yore upon the subject. These having lain dormant for some years, our author, with a felicity peculiar to himself (and let no man crop his laurels), hath revived with great eclat.

Among other excellencies, remarkable is his dexterity in the use and application of technical terms: infidel, jesuit, heretic, enthusiast, schismatic, sceptic, atheist, freethinker, socinian, arian, &c. are all indiscriminately thrown together, and hustled about, as in a common combination against the interests of the church of England; and from thence so artfully exhibited to the populace, that, though he does not venture himself expressly to point out the proprietors of these names, yet he goes so far as that he may depend upon it, the million will not leave it short, but with one voice chuse the Disquisitors

Knights o'th' shire, to represent them all.

On one occasion indeed he seems to have ventured a little beyond his ground; it is page 74. where he hath singled out "the papist, as "more especially capable of appearing in every "shape, and in every disguise;" consequently in the habit and language of a member of the established church; and, if our annals say truly, in this very habit and language hath the

papist been more than once surprized, particularly at those times when a comprehension between churchmen and dissenters hath been proposed.

Some such design of comprehension is, I find, laid to the charge of the authors of the Disquisitions. But whether this be their design or not, if a comprehension should be the effect of an impartial and judicious review, many candid and competent judges are of opinion, that the said authors are worthy to be heard on that very account, as no measure is so likely to be fatal to the popish interests in this kingdom as a firmer union, and more extensive alliance of protestants: and some have not scrupled to add, that no book that hath appeared in England for these last fifty years, hath been so little to the taste of the papists as these same Disquisitions.

Now it is possible these remarks may fall into the hands of some persons whose heads are turned to conceptions of this kind, with whom the remarker's concession above-mentioned may create some strange suspicions: for example, some such reader may take a fancy, that no man could write these remarks without a jesuit at his elbow; and if he is a reader also (like our remarker) of the exaggerating class, he will not be long in prying out the cloven foot.

He will observe, that the remarker is for rooting up the tares, though at the hazard of destroying the wheat with them; whilst the true protestant principle is that of our blessed Saviour, *let both grow together until the harvest.* He will observe, that the remarker's zeal is not by

far so tender and touchy on the subject of those alterations that relate to the bible, as of those that respect the liturgy; altho' whatever argument makes for a new translation, or any other amendments of our english editions of the scriptures, concludes with redoubled force for a thorough review of the rest of our services; inasmuch as our whole ecclesiastical plan must be understood to be accomodated to the sense of scripture; as it is exhibited in our present english version; and, lastly, he will observe, that there is not one of this remarker's arguments which would not operate with equal effect, even though the missal *secundum usum Sarum* was the liturgy in debate.

For my own part, I am not at all inclined to ascribe any such principles to the remarker, I really take him to be a weak and warm son of the church of England, extremely defective in his judgment of men and things in general, and of the true end and design of the gospel of Christ in particular: in a word, one who, having borne about him the prejudices of his nursery, through all his reading and conversation for many years, thinks it now a point of honour to abide by them to the last, and never so much as dreams that his honesty may be concerned in the use of any low craft his capacity suggests to him, provided it may be turned to the account of his cause, or to the disadvantage of that of his opponents.

Such a man, and such a writer (his errors and mistaken zeal being first pointed out for a warning) is richly intitled to our pity, and our prayers, that his heart and head may be warmed and enlightened with a better spirit, a spirit

of charity, wisdom, and understanding. Towards this, I trust, his own endeavours will not be wanting; and do therefore intreat him, that before he proceeds farther to tamper with the motes in the eyes of the Disquisitors, he would bestow some little pains upon the beams that may be in his own.

POSTSCRIPT.

TO incline the sincere and well-disposed members of the church of England, to examine well the grounds of all popular prejudice on so important a subject, as that of the Disquisitions, I beg leave to offer the following particulars to their serious consideration.

In the *London Evening-Post* of *Tuesday, March* 20, there was a very devout and edifying poem on the subject of the late earthquakes, the last stanza of which was as follows:

Spare us, good lord, thy people spare;
Our fathers us'd this humble pray'r,
  Nor DISQUISITIONS knew.
Let us address the throne of grace
In the SAME FORM, that God may cease
  His vengeance to pursue.

The propriety of the exhortation in the three last lines of this sonnet, so far as it concerns the Disquisitions, depends upon one or other of these two suppositions; viz. either that the Disquisitions propose to alter this humble prayer; or that the prayer itself, to make it effectual, must stand as it now does, in company with the same form, meaning the whole liturgy, as we now have it.

If the first of these be the poet's meaning, the supposition is false, and the exhortation

impertinent: concerning this humble prayer in particular, nothing is said in the Disquisitions; and so far, for ought the Disquisitions have suggested, we may still pray in the same form our forefathers did, and know Disquisitions too.

If the words, the same form, take in the whole liturgy, as we now have it, it is incumbent upon the poet to shew why we have more to hope for from the use of this same form than another; and all the way, indeed, there is of shewing this, is by appealing to the history of our forefathers, and pointing out the instances where the vengeance of God was averted by the use of this particular form, which we all know was finished as we now have it in the year 1662.

To enable us to make this estimate, on the 31st of the same month of March, comes another serious writer; and, in the same London Evening Post, among other instances of God's vengeance on this nation, tells us, that, in the year 1665, (just three years after the introduction of the same forms recommended in the verses) the plague took off no less than 68,596 souls in our capital city; and that the year following 13,200 houses, in the same city, were consumed by fire.

It was, I suppose, the purpose of the prose-writer to put us in mind, to what extremities we have reason to fear the vengeance of God might be pursued; and the plain purpose of the poet is to furnish us with a preservative in the same form, to avert a farther vengeance; and to recommend his expedient, he tells us, our forefathers used it; but were they not our

forefathers too, who (notwithstanding their use of this form) suffered so severely in these two dreadful calamities? And that the form itself was then in high reputation, there can be no better proof, than that the very parliament, which had adjourned to Oxford, on account of the plague at London, enacted, during their secession, the law called the five-mile-act, in favour of this form.

Lay these facts, then, and the poetical insinuation together, and see what consequence you can draw from them, in favour of the present form of our liturgy.

And lest it should be said, that nobody would have thought of laying them together; and that, by so doing, I have only shewn the force of my own prejudice; I humbly crave the reader's attention to the following sentiments of one of our historians, who was an eye-witness of the facts above-mentioned, and an ear-witness of the reflections of those times upon them.

"The parliament chimed in with the church, "and, by the *Act of uniformity*, enjoin, that "every one who holds any ecclesiastical pro- "motion, shall publicly declare, before his "congregation, his unfeigned assent and con- "sent to every thing contained and prescribed "in the book intituled the book of common- "prayer, &c. Put these together; I A. B. do "declare my unfeigned assent and consent, "that the king (Charles II.) is my most re- "ligious and gracious king. If he be so, how "came you to know it? And if you do not "know it, how came you so unfeignedly to "assent and consent that he is so? But though

"to get your livelihood, you tell the congre-
"gation so, when you do not know it; I think
"it is dreadful for you to tell God Almighty
"he is so. But you will soon see what care
"the king took of the church of England,
"which took such care for him.

"Was God well pleased with these things?
"You shall soon see unjust wars, and disho-
"nourable peace: such judgments of plague,
"fire, and invasion, into our ports, as never
"before were heard of."*

There is little occasion to make any remarks on this passage; the sensible and ingenuous reader will presently perceive, that the historian was as far misled by his prejudice on one side, as the sonneteer was on the other.

There is indeed reason enough to believe, that Almighty God could not be well pleased with the severities with which the act of uniformity was carried into execution, nor, consequently, with the promoters of the act itself, which gave occasion to these severities; but the argument cannot be carried higher to the disparagement of the forms enacted, inasmuch as, during the times the same forms have been in use, we have had as great national prosperity and as signal blessings, as in any period in our history.

The historian however concludes with a reflection which might easily have set him right. —"And tho' (says he) God's judgments were in
"the land, the people did not learn righteous-
"ness, but continued a divided and factious
"nation, and a people laden with iniquity."

* *Coke's Detection, Vol.* II. p. 121.

Little reason then to approve or to reprobate the forms by this kind of test: the principles and manners of our people will ever afford a sufficient account of public calamities, and the mercy and compassion of God a sufficient reason for their abatement, without having recourse to the impropriety of our forms, on the one hand, or their virtue and efficacy, as forms, on the other: if the heart be not right with God, it matters little, that we address him in in the best forms; as, again, if there is but a due measure of inward piety and sincerity in our addresses to him, it is less material in what forms they are expressed. So that, upon the whole, the question still returns upon us; are the authors of the disquisitions right in their reasonings on our present forms, or not? Is a review of them reasonable and expedient, or is it not? Lay aside all foolish prejudice and clamour, and let the men be fairly tried by the merits of their cause.

THE END.

No Proof in the Scriptures of an intermediate State of Happiness or Misery between Death and the Resurrection.

In ANSWER to

Mr. GODDARD's SERMON,

PREACHED AT

St. Edmunds-Bury, February 25th, 1756.

To which are added,

REMARKS on a letter in the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1756, and on a paragraph in a Sermon of Archbishop Tillotson's.

WITH

A POSTSCRIPT,

In answer to some remarks upon a late Treatise relating to the Intermediate State, &c.

[FIRST PRINTED, M CC LVI.]

REMARKS

ON

Mr. GODDARD's SERMON, &c.

IN the sermon before us Mr. Goddard undertakes to prove an intermediate state of happiness or misery between death and the resurrection, from scripture. Let us suppose this gentleman to have succeeded in his enterprize, and to have made out this point beyond contradiction; and then let us attend to the consequences.

The scripture is represented on another hand, as affirming, "that the dead shall not awake or "be made alive *till* the resnrrection.—That the "wicked shall not be severed from the righ-"teous *till* the resurrection.—That all mankind "are upon a state of trial *till* the resurrection. "—That our christian course and improve-"ments in piety in this world, *terminate* in the "resurrection.—That the elect shall not be "gathered together *till* the resurrection.—"That the world shall not be judged *before* "the resurrection.—That sincere christians "shall not have boldness or confidence be-"fore Christ *till* the resurrection.—That the "virtuous shall not be rewarded *till* the resur-"rection.—That they shall not have eternal "life or salvation,—shall not put on immor-

" tality,—be received unto Christ,—enter into " his joy,—behold his glory,—or be like him, " *till* the resurrection.—That the faith, la- " bours and sufferings of christians are lost, " perished and unprofitable, if there be *no* re- " surrection.—That the resurrection is the grand " object of the faith, hope and comfort of chris- " tians.—And, lastly, that the wicked will " not be punished *till* the resurrection."

These propositions are advanced in a late tract published by a learned and eminent divine, as plain and undeniable scripture-truths, supported by particular texts subjoined, in no small number, to each of them.*

This small tract, the author of this sermon had in his eye. It was the last that appeared on the subject before he preached the sermon; and he hath cited it in two or three places.

Has Mr. G. then disproved these propositions, or given a different sense to the several scriptures which are appealed to in support of them? No, he hath meddled with very few of them: and the doctrine they are said to contain stands good for any thing Mr. G. hath proved or attempted to prove to the contrary.

And if Mr. G's doctrine stands good too, the consequence will be, that we have here two contradictory doctrines proved from the same scriptures. A circumstance which cannot be very agreeable to the friends of revelation, particularly as it tends to bring in question the truth of the capital doctrine of the christian

* *Vid.* Appendix to—*Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, &c. By Edmund Law, D. D. Master of St. *Peter's* college, *Cambridge*. The third edition, 1755. Page 373—386.

religion, *the reality of a future state of rewards and punishments.* For if both these doctrines, the doctrine of the sermon, and the doctrine of the appendix, may be proved from scripture, I do do not see how we can certainly depend upon scripture in any thing it teaches concerning a future state at all.

It is true the texts alleged in the apppendix do not contain an absolute negation of an intermediate state in terms. But they contain what is equivalent to it. They assign the resurrection, the last day, the second coming of Christ, &c. as the period which is to verify and accomplish all the gospel-promises and threatnings relating to a future state; and by not assigning or referring to any other period, they plainly exclude any other , as is particularly evident from that single text i. Cor. xv. 13, 14. *If there be no resurrection of the dead then is Christ not risen ; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain.* Here the apostle Paul makes the future happiness of all christian believers to depend upon a single matter of fact, the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Whereas the intermediate state of happiness contended for depends upon no such thing as a resurrection, nor, according to Mr. G. hath any thing to do with this particular fact ; for he puts the penitent thief into actual possession of his intermediate happiness two days before the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Again. An intermediate state of happiness and misery, having respect to the deeds and dispositions of mankind in this life, is an intermediate state of rewards and punishments

in a strict and proper sense. This idea indeed, the patrons of an intermediate state chuse to keep out of sight as much as they can, because of an unlucky question which it naturally suggests, namely, what occasion in such a case for a general resurrection, and a formal judgment afterwards?

Of two successive states of rewards and punishments without any state of probation intervening, it will not be easy to give any satisfactory account upon any received principles of reason, or any philosophical notions of the moral government of God. And therefore if two such states may be proved from revelation, we might hope to find in revelation some clear and consistent reasons for both. Revelation, indeed, hath sufficiently accounted for one such state, namely, that which will succeed the general resurrection. Bnt concerning the reasons and uses for another, the scriptures, whatever may be proved from them besides, have left us quite in the dark. That is to say, if we agree with Mr. G. the scriptures have revealed to mankind a great gospel-truth, which it highly concerns us to believe and remark, without vouchsafing to acquaint us with the importance of it.

Mr. G. indeed hath provided for his intermediate state of happiness certain extraordinary portions of divine grace,* which looks as if he intended it for a state of probation, rather than of reward: for what demand is there for grace in a state where there are no trials? And, on the other hand, why a second state of pro-

* Serm. p. 23.

bation before we have given any account of what has passed in the first?

In a word, the doctrine maintained in the appendix is so clear and accountable in itself, and so consistent with the general tenor of the scriptures; and that of Mr. G. so encumbered with difficulties of various kinds, that we may well presume there must be some mistakes in the scripture proofs of the latter; which we shall now without farther preface proceed to consider.

The passage of scripture which Mr. G. pitches upon for his text, as of all others the fullest to his purpose,* is Luke xxiii. 43. where our Saviour says to the penitent thief who was crucified with him,—*To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.*

"The use which has been generally made "of these words, says Mr. G. has been to "shew that this gracious promise—can afford "no encouragement to a death-bed repentance, "because there is such a wide and manifest "difference betwixt the case of this man, and "that of other sinners."†

A most unlucky observation to set out with! For will not the same wide and manifest difference between this and other cases, equally prove that it is a peculiar case throughout, and no more applicable to the future state of other penitent sinners in general, than it is to the pardon of other sinners repenting on a death-bed? Take this author's interpretration of our Saviour's promise to this dying melefactor, with all it's circumstances, and you will find

* Serm. Page 7. † Page 5.

no such promise ever made to any other person, much less to the whole number of penitent believers: and, if the fact was not so indisputably against you, you might as well argue from the cases of Enoch and Elijah, that all men who walk uprightly before God upon earth will be translated to another state without passing through a state of death, as from this case that the souls of all good men do, upon their separation from the body, immediately enter upon a state of happiness.*

We might then safely allow Mr. G. to abound in his own sense of the word paradise; we might allow the promise to have been fulfilled to the thief on the very day it was made; we might even allow his soul to have entered paradise while his body hung on the cross; and still insist that the case is singular; an act of grace to this particular man, on that signal occasion, from which no argument can be drawn for a common receptacle of the souls of all good men between death and the resurrection.

But we are told, that "the jews in our Saviour's time universally understood the word "paradise in that sense; that consequently "the thief must have understood it so; and "that for Jesus to have used the word in any "other, would have been to deceive and trifle "with the thief," with some other indiscreet expressions hardly fit to be repeated.†

That our Lord adapted his language to this man's notions as far as was neeessary, there can be no doubt. But the first question before us is, what were this man's notions (not of para-

* Page 12. † Serm. page 9.

dise but) of the kingdom of Christ? Now by the kingdom of Christ, the jews of our Saviour's time, generally understood a temporal kingdom of earthly happiness; to this they likewise gave the name of the future world; and many of those among them who believed a resurrection, considered it as introductory to the felicities of such a kingdom only. And that the penitent thief himself still retained that notion of it, appears pretty plainly from his words ὁταν ἐλης εν τη βασιλειᾳ σου, *when thou comest* (not into, as our translation gives it, but) *in thy kingdom;* i. e. when thou comest on earth in power and great glory as we expect,—*then, remember me.*

Now had our saviour told this man that he should be with him in this kingdom on that day or any day, he would indeed have deceived him and trifled with him; because such a kingdom was never to be. And therefore to prevent all misunderstanding of that sort, our Lord promises that he should be with him in a state of being, which indeed was commonly understood to have nothing to do with this world. And as the dying penitent would sufficiently apprehend, by this term, what was not promised, and that some great thing was promised in lieu of it, there was no occasion for our Lord to keep precisely to the Jewish notions of paradise, even supposing those notions to be universally fixed to one certain sense. For I suppose no body will imagine that our Lord intended to give this man an accurate and complete idea of a state, which, whatever the jews might think of it, the sa-

cred writers speak of as out of the reach of all human comprehension.

But upon what authority does Mr. G. conclude that the jews, in our Saviour's time, universally understood the word paradise in the sense that he puts upon it? I am afraid he has here depended upon Grotius farther than he had good reason. For though Grotius in that long note which Mr. G. refers to, is serving the same hypothesis, yet he knew better than to affirm, that the jews had one uniform system of notions concerning paradise. However, what Grotius has omitted, the late learned Professor Wetstein, in his commentary on this place of Luke, has amply supplied from Josephus and the rabbins. And here Mr. G. may see strange things in the jewish notions of paradise. He may see among the same prayers he hath referred us to, paradise expressly called eternal life. He may see translated bodies as well as souls in paradise; and a variety of entertainment provided for the inhabitants of that happy region, little suited to the nature and occasions of souls in a state of separation from their bodies.

And that he may likewise see, if he pleases, that his inferences are not quite so obvious to every one who has considered the subject as he would have it believed, I have put down in the margin, Mr. Wetstein's very sensible reflection upon the collection of authorities he has exhibited.*

* Quæritur jam quid Christus latronem intelligere voluerit per paradisum promissum? Certe hac voce, nec judæorum fabulas, nec sententiam Essenorum de solius animæ æterna felicitate, nec pharisæo-

Well, but "St Paul makes the same distinc-"tion (between paradise and the world to "come) when giving an account of the extra-"ordinary revelations he was favoured with, "he declares some of them to have been made "to him in paradise, and others in the third "heaven,* or region of supreme happiness."†

Here we have an arbitrary paraphrase of the third heaven, which our author (misled by Grotius) will have to signify the region of supreme happiness. Whereas, if we take the apostle's account as it lies in a natural gradation of ascent from a lower to a higher sphere of felicity, paradise must be situated in the superior region of the two. This is likewise suggested to us by the other circumstances of the narrative. What the apostle heard or saw in the third heaven, or whether any thing surpassing his conception, he mentions not. But in paradise he heard *unspeakable words which it is not lawful* (or *possible*) *for a man to utter.* So that if a plain man must needs determine which of these two is the region of supreme happiness, he will make little difficulty in giving the preference to paradise.

But what does this author talk of supreme happiness in the third heaven? It is well known that the jews reckoned in all (not three, but) seven heavens, to each of which they gave a

rum aut mohammedanorum de deliciis, approbavit, sed illud unum voluit, ut latro optima quævis et majora quidum quam a doctoribus audierat, vel ipse prius animo conceperat speraret, locum tutum et securum tempore inter mortem et resurrectionem medio, et æternum in cælis gaudium post resurrectionem. Wetstein in Luc. xxiii. 43.

* 2 Cor. xii. 1—4. † Serm. p. 10.

distinct name.* That is to say, they reckoned four regions above our author's region of supreme happiness. And to these notions we must (upon Mr. G's own principles) suppose St. Paul to conform his language. It is therefore full as probable, considering the order in which the apostle relates these two raptures, that he placed paradise in one of these upper regions; which he might very well do (even in the very highest of them) without offering any violence to the received notions of the jews concerning the separate state of existence for the souls of good men.†

The author of the appendix has dropped a friendly hint, that St. Paul had these scenes of felicity communicated to him in a vision.‡— Mr. G. upon occasion can retreat nimbly enough under figure and scenery, to shelter himself from the evidence of his own authorities; and what has he got by adopting the literal sense here? Even the satisfaction of having discovered that paradise, for all that St. Paul knew, might be a mansion for the bodies as well as the souls of men:—that the idea

* Vid. Wetſtein in loc.

† Joſephus, who, as well as St. Paul, was a Phariſee, at leaſt in his opinions concerning a future ſtate, places the departed ſouls of good men ἐν τῳ ἁγιωτάτῳ οὐρανου χωρῳ *in the holieſt region of heoven.* Bell. iii. 7. 5. Huds. But after all it would be in vain to attempt to fix the meaning of Chriſt and his apoſtles, when they ſpeak of a future ſtate by the vague and infinitely varying notions of the jews on this ſubject. The ſacred writings, in this point at leaſt, are the beſt explainers of themſelves. Baſnage has made it very probable that the Phariſees, even of our Saviour's time, held the tranſmigration of ſouls. Hiſt. of the jews. B. ii. c. xi.

‡ Page 395.

of it is inexpressible and incommunicable to man, consequently—that our Saviour did not intend to convey by this term the precise notion of any particular state of felicity so and so circumstanced; and lastly—that both our Saviour and St. Paul most probably meant, by paradise, the region or state of supreme happiness.* From which particulars we take leave to conclude, either that this promise made to the penitent malefactor was peculiar to his, and perhaps a few more cases; or, that the performance of it might be deferred till the general resurrection, very consistently with the true meaning of the expression, *to day*.

For what has this author brought to shew that this expression may not be understood with the same latitude here, in which he owns it to be taken elsewhere? Nothing at all but the uniformity of the jewish opinion concerning paradise. And how little reason he had to depend upon this inference, Grotius himself might have informed him, who a very few lines below those Mr. G. has quoted from him, observes that, "it was not without a weighty "reason that our Saviour used the expression "*to day*. For the jews believed, not that the "souls of all men were immediately admitted "into the happy state of paradise, but those "only which departed out of this world well "purged." Grotius indeed has worded this so that an inattentive reader may, if he pleases, understand by it, that all the rest were utterly excluded. But this, as we learn from other hands, was by no means the case. This prepa-

* Compare 1 Cor. ii. 9.

ratory purgation was not always accomplished while the soul remained in the body. For the souls even of the better sort wandered about accomplishing this purgation for the space of a year.* After which they were permitted to settle in the happy region allotted for them.

For my own part, as I see no sufficient importance in this weighty reason of Grotius (even supposing these fancies to have prevailed so early among the jews) to demand our Saviour's regard, nor indeed the least reason to imagine that by paradise, any other state was intended, but that of final rest and happiness; so do I see no inconvenience in understanding the words *to day*, of the sure confirmation and present sealing of that happiness, without any farther intervening trials.

In St. Luke xix. 9. our Lord says to Zaccheus, σημερον σωτηρια τω οικω τουτω εγενετο, *To day hath salvation happened to this house.* The word σημερον is the same by which the promise is limited in the case of the penitent thief. And there is not a stronger word in the whole new testament to denote the actual accomplishment of any thing than εγενετο. But the actual accomplishment of salvation is nothing less than the actual possession and present enjoyment of eternal life.

Suppose now the late Mr. Asgill, who very much wanted an instance of a translated christian believer, had laid his hands on this text, and had insisted upon it as good evidence that Zaccheus was actually translated that very day; arguing as Mr. G. has done, that if any fu-

* Vid. Burnet's Exp. Art, Folio, p. 222, and Basnage, Hist. Jews, B. iv, c. 30. p. 384.

ture immortality beyond the limits of that same day was meant; our Lord must have deceived and trifled with Zaccheus, &c. how would you have disproved him? Direct evidence of the fact there is none on the one side or the other. And you could only have said, that as salvation is represented according to the general tenor of the new testament, as a thing to which christian believers have but a presumptive heirship in this world (τους μελλονΐας κληρονομειν σωτηριαν, Heb. i. 14.) it would be absurd to interpret this declaration otherwise than as a present confirmation or assurance of eternal life in the world to come. And if this ought to have satisfied Mr. Asgill, why should not the same answer satisfy Mr. G. in a similar case?

But it must not be forgot that there is one construction of the Greek words containing our Saviour's promise to the penitent thief, which limits no time for his being in paradise with Christ. Remove the comma from σοι, where the common editions place it, and put it after σημερον, thus, Αμην λεγω σοι σημερον μετ' εμου εση —*I say unto thee to day, thou shalt be*, &c. and the time of fulfilling the promise will be left indefinite.

Mr. G. holds this construction in the utmost contempt: "It is low and absurd—looks like "a burlesque on scripture,—is unworthy of a "scholar, and even of a man of the plainest "understanding."* A sort of answer that gives one no trouble but that of writing down so many words.

But did Mr. G. understand the tenor of the

* Serm. Page 12.

argument grounded on this construction? I am afraid not, if we judge from the childish paraphrase he has given us; "I did not tell "thee so yesterday, nor will I tell thee so "to-morrow, but I say unto thee *to-day*, "&c." As if there was nothing going before to induce our Lord to make the promise one day more than another.

Whereas the propriety of this construction (and, whatever Mr. G. may think, a propriety there is in it) arises from hence,—that the penitent thief having desired to be remembered when our Saviour should come in his kingdom; that is, to be remembered at a future period, the answer of Jesus gives him to understand that he was remembered at that instant, and so effectually remembered, that whenever Jesus himself should be in paradise, the thief might be sure of being there with him.

And what is there in this either low or absurd, or void of scholarship and common sense?* How many instances might be brought, where to avoid the malign aspect of a plain text upon an orthodox point, very learned and able divines have taken refuge in constructions much more unaccountable than this? And after

* *Est autem illud* HODIE (says Grotius) εμφατικον *et solet beneficiorum mentioni adjici, ut* Jerem i. 10—An observation which is neither true nor pertinent, but upon the supposition that the construction under consideration is the true one; or else that the benefits mentioned are future, and that the emphatical *Hodie* employed rather to ascertain the reality, than to mark the time of confering such benefits. In Mr. G's interpretation, the word *Hodie* has no especial emphasis.

all, who or what is there to put it out of doubt that this was not St. Luke's own pointing?

"Why, says Grotius, the Syriac version;" which it seems gives this passage as if the Greek words had been Αμην λεγω σοι στι σημερον—e. q. s. *verily I say unto thee* THAT *to day*, &c. which indeed leaves no room for any construction but that in our common books.

I am not critic enough to know how far the Syriac version is to be depended upon in general with respect to its deviations from the received Greek-text; (which by the way are neither few nor inconsiderable) but in the present case its authority cannot be very decisive; since according to Tremellius, the word ὡι which we read immediately before σημερον Luke xix. 9, is wholly omitted in the Syriac, though the corresponding word καθοτι in the latter clause of the verse, plainly requires that it should be expressed. Mr. G. perhaps may now see that the espousers of the construction he ridicules so wantonly, are not so much graveled as he may imagine, and that the absurdity and want of scholarship he mentions may belong to some body else.

Having now paid our due respects to Mr. G's. text and his several comments upon it, we proceed to consider his other testimonies.

"In the old testament indeed, says Mr. G. "there are but few passages to be met with for "our purpose, and those not so full and direct "to the point in hand, as that much greater "number which the new abounds with. And "no wonder, since the law of Moses was "founded wholly on temporal sanctions; "whereas the gospel was established upon bet-

" ter promises, and life and immortality could " not have been said to be brought to light by " the gospel, if they had been clearly and fully " revealed by the former dispensation."*

But here we must take the freedom to remind Mr. G. that the life and immortality brought to light by the gospel, was that life and immortality only which will succeed a general resurrection; and which was evidenced and insured to mankind by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And therefore whatever was true concerning any intermediate life of the soul in a state of separation from the body, might safely be revealed before the gospel without any diminution of, or derogation from the light peculiar to it.

If Mr. G. by saying that the law of Moses was founded on temporal sanctions only, means to insinuate that the revelation of an intermediate state of happiness and misery for departed souls would have clashed with the sanctions of the Mosaic dispensation; I answer that the very same inconvenience would arise from the revelation of such a state under the gospel. The sanctions of the gospel are rewards and punishments in a future state (not where the soul exists separately from the body, but) where the body will be raised to a new life, and the compound man so re-animated brought to a judgment which will have respect alone to the deeds done in his mortal body. But the happiness or misery of a soul in a state of separation from the body has no more connexion with the circumstances of such a judgment,

* Serm. Page 12.

than it has with the promises and threatenings of the law of Moses. Such happiness or misery is as distinct from, and as contrary to the happiness or misery of the latter dispensation as of the former: and the reasonable presumption is, that such an intermediate state is revealed under both dispensations, or under neither.

But this revelation Mr. G. will not surely pretend to find in these few texts he has cited from the old testament, the gathering and going down one to another mentioned in them being quite indiscriminate without any respect to good or evil; a representation only of the general state of the dead, and just as applicable to their bodies as their souls. As for his acute questions,—"Can the thing which is not, "be said to be gathered to the thing which is "not! Or can nothing be said to go to noth-"ing?"* We think they concern Solomon as much to the full as any one else, who in a citation brought by Mr. G. the very next line but one, talks of *the dust returning to the earth;* that is, I suppose, according to Mr. G's ideas, of nothing returning to nothing.

Mr. G. indeed would make Solomon tell us "of two different natures in man, and of as-"signing one of these natures to a state of hap-"piness or misery immediately upon its sepa-"ration from the other."† But Solomon was wiser than to talk of what he knew nothing of; and no man but one who pretends to be wiser than Solomon, would venture to tell us what Solomon should have said, where Solomon himself is silent.

* Serm p. 14. † Ibid.

Mr. G. opens his proofs from the new testament with the story of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19,* where the first remarkable things we meet with in the intermediate state supposed to be there represented, are souls with fingers and tongues,—souls liable to the torments of fire and refrigerations of water.

To avoid this incongruity, we are told that some parts of this parable are of the figurative and scenical kind. It had been much to Mr. G's purpose to have told us what parts of this or indeed any other parable are not of the figurative and scenical kind. It is upon the account of the figure and scenery that runs through all parables that we object to their being brought in proof either of real facts or positive doctrines. Because such discourses, so far as they are figurative and scenical, must likewise be fictitious.

"But, says Mr. G. the main scope and design "of this parable can be no other than to shew "that there is a place of joy and comfort for "the righteous, and another of torment for the "wicked, to which they will be instantly con-"veyed upon their departure out of this world." Meaning, as I suppose, that this instantaneous conveyance is not scenical, whatever the rest may be.

If this be so, Mr. G. must have explained the evangelist very ill. For he tells us that the rich man lift up his eyes in the place of torment (or *Hades*) no sooner than he was buried, which considering the state and opulence

* Page 15.

of the man in his life time, would hardly be the instant he expired. I remark this only to convince Mr. G. that before he can accommodate St, Luke's language to his own ideas, he will have just as much occasion for figure and scenery in this part of the parable as in any other.

Again, if you take even the plainest part of the parable literally, it will imply that Moses and the prophets taught a future state of rewards and punishments as the direct and proper sanctions of that dispensation under which they ministered. This we know Mr. G. will not allow, nor indeed is it true. Our Saviour therefore in this place must be understood to consider Moses and the prophets, not according to their original designation, but under the actual capacity in which they were of teaching a future state at that particular time; namely, under the capacity of school-masters to bring the Jews unto Christ, by whom life and immortality were fully and perfectly revealed, and made the sanctions of a new dispensation.*

In one word, the plain tenor of this narrative is to convince the jews by a scenical representation adapted to their own conceptions, that the lot of the righteous and wicked after death is finally and irrevocably determined, (a circumstance, by the way, very unfavourable to the notion of an intermediate state) and that the means of salvation they had already in their hands were so full and sufficient for the purpose, that if they would not believe and

* Gal. iii. 24. comp. Rom. x. 4. John v. 46.

repent upon the prevailing motives and inducements already afforded them, neither would they be persuaded, though an eye-witness of the happiness and misery of a future state were to rise from the dead, and testify unto them the things that he had seen and heard. And the moral of the parable being so very obvious, of what importance was it, whether the scenery was borrowed from a state of things then subsisting, or from one to be realized hereafter? If the instruction was conformed to the ideas of the jews in order that they might profit by it for the present, what matter whether those ideas were mistaken ideas or not?

It is in vain therefore for Mr. G. to argue, that "if Christ had only intended to describe "that state of happiness and misery which "will not commence till the resurrection, that "part of the parable which plainly supposes "the resurrection not yet come, could only "serve to confound and mislead his hearers;"* for how easy is it to turn his own artillery upon him, and to say, "if Christ had only intend-"ed to describe that intermediate state of "happiness and misery which is peculiar to "the purely immaterial principle in man; that "part of the parable which represents con-"scious beings in this intermediate state as "having bodily parts and passions, could only "serve to confound and mislead his hearers, "&c." Does he think his opponents will "not take advantages to which they have an equal right with himself?

* Page 16.

The next testimony for an intermediate state is brought by Mr. G. from Matth. x. 28. *Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.* In answer to the objection drawn from this passage, the learned author of the appendix had said, "this only points out the distinction between "this and the next life, when soul and body "are reunited, and future punishments com- "mence."* This sense of the words Mr. G. treats as "unnatural—thrown out merely to "supply the want of something better to offer "—the effect of a violent hurry to get rid of a "text which so utterly confounds those who "are of the opinion contrary to his."†

Well then, what is Mr. G's sense of these words? Why he tells us that, "our Lord "here plainly declares, that the soul will sub- "sist and live after its separation by death "from the body." And does not our Lord as plainly declare in the latter part of the verse (which Mr. G. hath wisely dropped, though perhaps not in so "violent a hurry") that the body will subsist and live after its separation by death from the soul? For I suppose Mr. G. himself would not make the difference here intimated between the power of God and the power of man to consist in the circumstance of destroying a dead carcase in hell. There is therefore a body as well as a soul which cannot be killed by man. Consequently the soul mentioned in the former part of the verse may not mean a substance wholly separable from and

* Appendix p. 391. † Serm. p. 16.

independent of the body, but merely that future life destined to the compound man at the resurrection, when his life or death will be wholly taken out of the power of his fellow-creatures, and remain in the power of God alone.

And this we shall have the greater reason to believe was our Lord's meaning when we consider the parallel place, Luke xii. 4, 5. *Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and* after that, *have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you shall fear; fear him who* after *he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell.* Here is no mention of the soul's subsisting after its separation from the body; no mention of any thing after death but the *casting into hell;* which it is plain does not happen till that which had been killed, viz. the man, is put into some new capacity of suffering, or, in other words, is once more become a living soul.

The whole force of Mr. G's reasoning then depends upon the mere supposition that our Saviour meant the same thing by ψυχη that he does by soul. But allowing Mr. G's notions concerning the human soul to be right, is he sure our translators are right in giving the word soul, as the proper english of ψυχη? Certain it is the same translators have given another word for ψυχη at V. 39 of this same chapter; being conscious, we may suppose, that the word soul as Mr. G. understands it, and as they themselves probably understood it, would have a strange effect in that passage; for thus would the verse have run, *he that findeth his* soul shall lose it; *and he that loseth his* soul *for my sake*

shall find it. Where, by *losing* the *soul* for the sake of Christ, is plainly meant the exposing the soul to all manner of hardships and sufferings, and even to death itself for the sake of the Gospel. The consequence of which would be (however Mr. G. may ridicule the inference in his adversaries) thar the soul might be killed, and by the very same people too who were able to kill the body. What is it then that makes life the properer and more intelligible word for ψυχη in this 39th verse, but that you are at liberty to understand it of life in two different respects? namely, of life or the living man with respect to this world in the first member of each clause; and of life or the living man with respect to a future world, in the second.

Let our Lord then have the benefit of explaining his own meaning by his own expressions, and you will be incumbered with none of Mr. G's imaginary absurdities about killing souls in this 28th verse, but have this plain and easy sense; "fear not those who kill the "mortal body, or extinguish the present life "of man, but are not able to kill, extinguish "or destroy his future life; but rather fear "God who hath both the present and future "life of of every man absolutely in his power."

It will probably be said that very good authors often use the same word in two different senses, and why not St. Matthew? I answer, because the same reasons for such different usage of this word in St. Matthew, cannot be given, that may be given for the different usage of the same word in other authors. The word soul occurs twice in this 28th verse,

and undoubtedly in the very same sense in both places, as appears from its being used in contradistinction to body in both. But the idea of destroying a soul in Gehenna is full as discordant with Mr. G's definition of soul, as it would be to put soul in the 39th verse, instead of life. Whence it is reasonable to conclude that soul in the former part of the 28th verse, cannot have the signification which Mr. G. contends for.

Indeed the liberties our translators have taken with the word ψυχη are quite unaccountable; particularly Matth. xvi. 25, 26. where this pretence of a double signification can have no place.

Whosoever, say they, *will save his life* [ψυχην] *shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life* [ψυχην] *for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul* [ψυχην] *or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul.* [ψυχης again.]

Here it is manifest that our Lord is speaking of ψυχη under one and the same idea in both verses. And what reason could the translators have to render it by two different words, but an unwarrantable inclination to accomodate our Saviour's language to their own system? Had they dealt impartially with the sacred text, they must either have put soul in the 25th verse, or life in the 26th. Try the experiment either way, and it will soon be seen how little Matth. x. 28. is for Mr. G's purpose.

Our author goes on. "The same blessed "Jesus when he was expiring on the cross, "recommends his departing soul to God in "this solemn form, *father, into thy hands I*

"*commend my spirit.** Here, we are told, our "Saviour's soul is solemnly recommended to "God by himself, in confidence that it would "continue in God's hands, and be preserved "and cherished by him, till he should send it "back again to it's former habitation."

Perhaps it may be remembered, that when Mr. G. had the case of the penitent thief under consideration, the doctrine was, that our Saviour's soul went instantly into paradise upon its separation from his body; and that paradise is an intermediate state appointed for the reception of the departed souls of all good men whatsoever. When therefore Mr. G. talks of "our Saviour's soul being preserved and "cherished in the hands of God till it was "sent back to its former habitation," how are we to understand him? For my own part I cannot conceive how a soul can be said to continue in the hands of God, and be by him preserved and cherished for a certain season, without being with God in the highest heaven for that season. And yet Mr. G. assures us, that our Lord was not with God in the highest heaven in his human nature till after his ascension. Here is then, to say the best of it we can, a strange incongruity of expression, which ought to be reconciled. For by the naked terms of these two descriptions of the state of our Saviour's soul, we are naturally led to imagine either that there are two intermediate states, to both which our Saviour's soul was consigned at the same time; or that our Saviour had two souls (corresponding to his two

* Luke xxiii. 46. *apud* Serm. p. 18, 19.

natures) one of which went into paradise, the common receptacle of the departed souls of all good men; another which was more especially recommended into the hands of God, for some particular privileges not to be conferred in a common intermediate state.

But the truth is, Mr. G. did not puzzle himself and his hearers by design. The translators have here once more misled him. For instead of that solemn recommendation of our Saviour's soul to God which their English word put into his head, the plain Greek words are only these, Πατερ εις χειρας σου παραθησομαι το πνευμα μου, literally, *father, into* [or in] *thy hands I will deposite my spirit* or *breath;* importing only our Lord's readiness to lay down his life, in consequence of the command he had received from the father, John x. 18. *to lay down his life, that he might take it again.*

The expression of the dying martyr Stephen, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit,* Acts vii. 59. is much to the same effect, as if he had said, *Lord Jesus accept * the sacrifice of my life which I now lay down for thy sake.* If this will not satisfy Mr. G. but he shall still insist

* The learned author of the appendix, seems, by the passages he has cited to explain it, not to understand this text as I do. What inclines me to give this paraphrase to Stephen's words, is, that the verb δεχομαι with its compounds and derivatives, is of frequent and familiar use in the Greek scriptures for that acceptance with which Almighty God honours those sacrifices, offerings, and gifts which are well pleasing to him. Of which, among many others, these instances may be given. Exod. xxviii. 38. Levit. i. 3, 4. xix. 5—7. xxii. 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, xxiii. 11. Deut. xxxiii. 11. 16. 23. Judges xiii. 23. Job viii. 20. Psalm l. 9. Prov. xi. 1. xii. 22. xv. 8. Isai. lvi. 7. lx. 7. Jer. vi. 20. Ezek. xx. 40. 41. xliii. 27. Amos v. 22. Malachi i. 8. 10. 13. ii. 13. Acts x. 35. 2 Cor. vi. 17. Philip. iv. 18. 1 Tim. v. 4.

that this receiving the spirit of Stephen is to be understood of the actual receiving of his soul by Christ, we shall presently see that this sense will carry us far beyond the confines of an intermediate state.

The next passage which Mr. G. brings in proof of his doctrine of an intermediate state, is Phil. i. 23, 24. where St. Paul says, *I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.**

Here it was Mr. G's business to shew, that Paul wished to be in an intermediate state of happiness, such as Mr. G. contends for, and that this was what the apostle meant by desiring to be with Christ. But instead of entering on this disquisition, our author falls to declaiming on the impropriety of Paul's preferring a state of insensibility for an interval of so many ages, to life, and thought, and the comforts of God's grace on earth, &c. All which proves nothing but Mr. G's extreme unwillingness to engage with the rational and judicious explanation given of this and some parallel texts by the author of the appendix, he would be understood to oppose.

Mr. G. I am afraid, by laying so great a stress on the length of the interval between death and the resurrection, intended to lead the imaginations of his audience to some frightful prospect of a long night of uncomfortable darkness, which however indifferent it may be to the dead, is apt to disquiet the living with

* P. 20.

some degree of terror and anxiety. Whereas had he told them, what is the honest truth, and what he himself has not the courage to disown, that an insensible clod cannot have the least idea of any difference between the length of an interval of ten thousand years, and the length of half a second of time; or had he only informed them that Paul himself speaks of the coming of Christ, and consequently of the resurrection of the dead, as events that were at hand, * the magic spell of his oratory had been broken at once, and his hearers would probably have perceived that this *desire to depart* carried Paul not only beyond a state of insensibility, but even beyond the pleasures and comforts of an intermediate state.

But let us take our author in his own way, and inquire what he would have us understand by *being with Christ.* And from this expression he says, "We may conclude that good "men in this [intermediate] state will, in "some particular sense, be with Christ, will "be under his continual care and protection, "and will even enjoy the sight of him, by "way of vision and revelation, as he was made "known to Abraham and the old prophets, "though in a much more perfect manner.†"

How cautiously and ambiguously is this worded, in comparison of what we meet with when paradise was under consideration?—But let us put a short question upon this obscure state of the case. Would this, does Mr. G.

* Concerning these expressions of St. Paul, and the other Apostles, see see Dr. Law's Considerations, p. 144, 145. 3d. Edit.

† Serm. p. 23.

think, have satisfied St. Paul's desire?—This something between being with and not with Christ?—Between being with him in a vision, and not in a vision? I hardly believe it would. And if not, we may be under the unwelcome necessity of concluding that St. Paul, in this passage, expressed an earnest desire to depart and to be conveyed immediately to the region of supreme happiness in the highest heaven. For where was Christ when St. Paul was in this strait? Undoubtedly in that heaven, and at the right hand of God: a situation far above the happiness of an intermediate state, as Mr. G. himself hath testified.

For, says Mr. G. "Our Lord could not consistently with truth tell the thief that he "should that day be with him in the highest "heaven, since he himself was not there in his "human nature till after his ascension."*—If you ask, where was he then between his death and his resurrection? Mr. G. answers, in paradise, or an intermediate state, between which and the highest heaven there is, according to Mr. G. a wide difference in the measure and degree of felicity appropriated to each.

One might ask Mr. G. how he comes to know all this? But we will put the question in another form. How came Mr. G. to be so very clear and positive concerning paradise when he was commenting on Luke xxiii. 43. and so mysterious and indeterminate upon Phil. i. 23, 24?

Perhaps the case might be this. The thief

* Serm. p. 10.

must either be really and literally with Christ in some state of conscious being, which was not the state of supreme felicity, and on that very day too when the promise was made, or all that Mr. G. was endeavouring to build upon this text, would inevitably fall to the ground. But by that time he got within sight of these verses in Philippians, he began to perceive that if he carried the like literal construction to the case of St. Paul, he might come to have two intermediate states upon his hands, which was by no means convenient: and a coalition of the two cases upon his avowed principles was impossible. For to be with Christ before and after his ascension, could never be reconciled to any one state of being, but that of supreme happiness, with which paradise in that case, would coincide, and to this coincidence the promise of the penitent thief must be accommodated accordingly.

What Mr. G. then had to do here, was to suppose the very thing in question; to declaim upon the eligibility of an intermediate state, before a state of insensibility; to appear to say something to the positive part of the apostle's desire, while he really said nothing; and by a cloud of unmeaning words to prevent us from perceiving that the apostle might desire something more eligible than either of the states he had been comparing together.

I have now only to observe farther, that if Stephen's dying address to Christ, Acts vii. 59. be understood as a petition, that his soul might be received by Christ and continue with him, as Mr. G. explains it, his case will be incumbered with the very same difficulties that intan-

gle that of St. Paul. And whatever solution may be found to reconcile one of them to Mr. G's doctrine of an intermediate state, will likewise disengage the other. And there, for the present, we leave them both.

Thus have we gone through all Mr. G's *scripture proofs of an intermediate state of happiness or misery, between death and resurrection.* Whether he has proved his point, we are not to pronounce. But there is one thing of which we apprehend many of the readers of his sermon may have taken some particular notice: and that is, that all these proofs relate to an intermediate state of happiness only, save one in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, which not agreeing with the notion of a soul in a state of separation from the body, is immediately evaporated into figure and scenery.

To supply this defect, Mr. G. proposes that we should infer an intermediate state of misery from an intermediate state of happiness, by way of analogy, or parity of reason: in which proposal I, for my own part, shall be very ready to oblige him, if Mr. G. will produce any one text of scripture in which either a probable reason of or any good use is assigned for an intermediate state of happiness; nay, I think I may venture to make the same promise in case Mr. G. can only invent such a reason or use which shall be perfectly consistent with, and is not already assigned for, and appropriated to a future state of rewards at the resurrection of the just. Such a reason, or such an use (which would take in the circumstances of all good men) being once assigned, we might possibly have some groundwork whereon to

frame an analogical argument for an intermediate state of misery for the wicked. But while no such general reason or general utility can be found for an intermediate state of happiness, the proofs brought by Mr. G. (even if we could possibly allow them to be proofs of the fact) would only relate to a few cases special and peculiar to the parties respectively concerned, and resolvable only into the good pleasure of God, without any shadow of a reason but what is hidden in the impenetrable depths of his secret counsels: and upon such reason or reasons who can pretend to frame analogies?

It might have been reasonably expected that something should have been said in a discourse on this subject, to those texts which seem to bear the hardest on the doctrine of an intermediate state of happiness or misery, for the human soul in a state of separation from the body. This Mr. G. declines, on the pretence that neither the nature nor the limits of a sermon would admit of it. But surely the plan of a sermon, as well as of any other discourse, is in the author's own power; and as the adverse party had brought a formidable number of scriptures to support his opinion, and had moreover pleaded that the whole tenor of the gospel-revelation runs in the same strain, the consideration of six or seven detached texts, which seem to have a sound the contrary way, can never be supposed to answer the end of a full and effectual confutation of him.

Indeed Mr. G. has furnished his disciples with an observation which, he thinks, will obviate the force of most of the conclusions

drawn from scripture in favour of the opinion of the soul's sleeping from death to the resurrection; and that observation is, that "man, "being a person compounded of two different "natures—it is no wonder that the scriptures, "when they are speaking of the state of the "dead, should sometimes affirm such things "of the whole man, as are only applicable to "one part of him, viz. his body."* By which, I suppose, Mr. G. means, that when the scriptures speak of dead and dying men as *sleeping*, *falling asleep*, &c. they are to be understood only of the sleep of the body.

Now if the scriptures had been as explicit concerning these two different natures in man, as Mr. G. is, we might have admitted the truth and propriety of his observation with less reluctance; but as we cannot find any such distinction as this so much as hinted at, or that, when the scriptures speak of a man's *sleeping in death*, they ever make the least mention of any part of him being awake, we justly suspect the observation is not well grounded. In the mean time there is an observation on the other hand, which is sufficiently notorious to every reader of the scriptures, namely, that the words σαρξ, σωμα, ψυχη, πνευμα, &c. which, according to the popular notion of man, are supposed to denote but one part of him, are not only sometimes, but very frequently used promiscuously to describe the whole compound man, whether living or dead.

Mr. G's concluding reflections, which stand

* Serm. p. 24, 25.

in the place of inferences, are the next things to be considered.

" He says first, that it appears from what he " has advanced, how false and groundless the " popish doctrine of purgatory is, which, he " observes, is as effectually confuted by his " doctrine, as by the contrary opinion."*

That's much indeed. The doctrine of no intermediate state at all, admits not of the least pretence for a purgatory, or any other popish bubble of that sort, by not leaving one saint in paradise to be prayed to, nor one sinner in the lower regions to be prayed for. Whereas an actual intermediate state, and that too proved from scripture, but where no precise nature or degrees of happiness or misery are ascertained in scripture or elsewhere, [see Serm. p. 22.] leaves room for all that the wild fancies and inventions of men can possibly imagine concerning the circumstances of such a state.

Well, but his reason. "Because says Mr. " G. such tormenting fires (as purgatory sup- " poses) are no less incompatible with a state " of happiness immediately following death, " than with a state of downright insensibility."

But what then? Has not Mr. G. his intermediate state of misery as well as happiness, " where the wicked are incessantly tormented, " &c?" With this disadvantage indeed on the part of Mr. G. that whereas the papist makes his intermediate torment a means of purgation, and of introducing his sinner to final pardon and peace, and so has a plausible

* P. 25, 26.

use for it, Mr. G. torments his souls without any sort of utility either to themselves or others, even for the mere sake of tormenting them: and all this not only for a long interval of many ages, but before their cause is determined or even heard: for he himself says, that these miserable souls shall not be doomed to their final fate (and consequently not tried or convicted) till the last day.*

In the mean time, be it noted that Mr. G's doctrine leaves the papists in full and quiet possession of all their interceding saints; and though perhaps it might be a disputable point between him and them in what particular mansions of felicity Peter and Paul have their residence; yet, being, according to Mr. G. with Christ in some particular sense, and even enjoying the sight of him, the papists will take leave to conclude that they are in some particular sense with the Father too; and consequently in a sufficient capacity to offer up their petitions to the throne of grace.

And here it may be proper to declare, that if it were only for the sake of this great corruption of the christian doctrine of one mediator, I should not be one of those who draw the conclusion mentioned in Mr. G's second reflection: namely, "that it is a point of no consequence "which of the two doctrines be received as the "true one;" the doctrine of the sermon, or the doctrine of the appendix. The very vitals of popery chiefly subsist by this doctrine of an intermediate state. Take away this doctrine, and you lay the grand fabric of that church

* P. 24.

in ruins. If you leave it with them, and especially if you leave it upon a scriptural foundation, you will find your difficulties greatly increased whenever you attempt to demolish what they think fit to build upon it, be it ever so ridiculous or extravagant. One need go no farther than this very sermon for an instance. What a miserably trifling confutation of purgatory is here? An intermediate state of torments cannot be an intermediate state of happiness! Why no, I suppose the papists themselves will not pretend to it. But if an intermediate state of torments may not be infered from an intermediate state of happiness, what becomes of Mr. G's analogy and parity of reason? And then again, as Mr. G. has furnished his intermediate state of happiness with certain portions of divine grace, let him put it to what use he pleases, he will leave the papists at liberty to find something analogous to it for an intermediate state of misery. And when to this it is added that no lights are given in scripture concerning the precise nature and degrees of happiness and misery in this state, but that men are left to circumstantiate the general fact supposed to be revealed in the scripture, according to their own fancies and imaginations, Mr. G. will find that purgatory, saint-worship, transmigration, and a thousand other fooleries will stick to his system like the leprosy; and are never to be wholly discarded but by renouncing the system itself.*

* It is but juſtice to obſerve that this reflection concerns Mr. G. only in common with other writers on the ſubject. Biſhop Burnet in particular is greatly embarraſſed between his endeavours to get rid of a purgatory, and to retain an intermediate ſtate. Upon the 22d article he ſays, "the ſcripture ſpeaks to us of two states after

Mr. G. and I are here so far of the same side, that he thinks it of consequence too that one of these opinions should be espoused rather than the other, though he as good as acknowledges, that "on the philosophical state of "either doctrine, the moment of our death "and that of our entering on reward or punish-"ment, will be immediately connected."

For what reason then, does the reader imagine, may Mr. G. think it of consequence to adhere to his side of the question? Why, "be-"cause it is the side to which the imaginations "of the people incline, and because the beha-"viour of the people is much more influenced "by the workings of their imaginations, than "by the real nature of things; so that no rea-"son, no philosophy (he might if he had pleas-

"this life—everlasting happiness for good men, and everlasting pu-"nishment for the wicked;—without the least hint of any middle "state after death, for men too good to be damned, but not good "enough to be immediately saved." And yet in the very next page we are told that, "some, upon very good grounds, have thought, "that the blessed, though admitted to happiness immediately upon "their death, yet were not so compleatly happy as they shall be "after the resurrection." These probable grounds, are two or three texts of scripture to which he just before refers. Here then we have a third state after death, which, though not precisely the middle state his lordship would avoid, is surely a middle state between this present life and everlasting happiness, of which no satisfactory account can be given, unless you will suppose these blessed not good enough to be immediately saved; (for salvation and eternal life or everlasting happiness are in the N. T. equivalent terms;) a notion, which, as we have seen, will equally favour a popish purgatory. But however the good bishop makes us ample amends in what follows: "and in this, says he, there arose a diversity of opinions, "which is very natural to all who will go and form systems out of "some general hints." Of these systems he proceeds to give a particular detail: whence we learn how naturally, when the trap-door of an intermediate state was once opened, men dropped into purgatories of various kinds and denominations.—See Burnet's Expos. xxix. Art. Edit. Folio, p. 220, 221, 222.

"ed have added, no scripture) will prevail on "them to consider two things as alike indiffer- "ent, which their imaginations represent to "them as of very unequal importance."*

So then the doctrine of an intermediate state is of consequence, because the populace imagine it to be the true doctrine, and when they take such fancies into their heads, seeing that no reason, no philosophy, no scripture will convince them, you must make what you can of their imaginations, humour them in their notions, and try what influence you can have with them that way.

Miserable state of things, when these become the maxims of christian teachers! when the ministers of him *who came to bear witness unto the truth*, and to *set all men free by the light of it*, are obliged to put this light under a bushel, lest it should offend the vitiated optics of men used to sit in darkness, and when they who should be the light of the world themselves, are forced to steer their own course by the glimmerings of other men's imaginations!

And yet the expedience of humouring the people, is, I'm afraid, the very best plea that protestant churches have to offer for declining to review their old systems, and to cast out of them all things that offend, and which upon examination should be found to be in no good agreement with the written word. 'Tis dangerous, they say to unsettle mens minds, and divert them from the paths wherein they have been accustomed to walk: but why was not this a consideration with our Saviour and his

* Serm. p. 26, 27.

apostles at the first planting of christianity? What respect do they appear to have paid to mens ancient opinions and prejudices when they were found to deviate from the truth? Or what danger do they seem to have apprehended in bringing men out of bondage and darkness into the regions of light and liberty? And let me add to this, that if this mean pusillanimous complaisance for the imaginations of the people had prevailed in these kingdoms above the love of truth, about two hundred years ago, the church of Rome had still stood where the church of England does now, and might have defended every error and every corruption we charge upon her by this very inexpedience of unsettling mens minds, with the same pertinence and propriety, and much greater consistency with themselves, than protestants can alledge it in any case.

And now I have mentioned the church, it comes into my head to put a question to Mr. G. viz. Upon what grounds he calls the doctrine of an intermediate state, the doctrine of our church? If the doctrine be true and agreeable to the scriptures, he may do well enough to establish it himself as he proposes, at his entrance upon his subject. But I cannot find that it is a doctrine already established in the church of England.

The articles of religion set forth in the reign of K. Edward VI, were in number 42; of which the 40th ran thus:

"They who maintain that the souls of men "deceased do either sleep without any manner "of sense to the day of judgment, or affirm "that they die together with the body, and

" shall be raised therewith at the last day, do " wholly differ from the right faith and ortho- " dox belief which is delivered to us in the " holy scriptures."

When the articles were revised in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and reduced to 39, this was one of those that were dropped. A certain sign that the church had then altered her opinion in this matter, and no longer thought the doctrine controverted by Mr. G. " did wholly " differ from the right faith and orthodox be- " lief delivered in the scriptures."

As to the passage in the burial-office, which affirms that " the souls of the faithful after " they are delivered from the burden of the " flesh, are with God in joy and felicity," we must take leave to dispute Mr. G's claim to it. When it is considered that St. Paul, speaking of the state of man after the resurrection, says that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;** and that the same apostle plainly intimates that the same period is allotted for the faithful's being taken to, and continuing with the Lord,† without mentioning any other; we cannot but think it far more likely that the compilers of this service should have these plain scriptures in their eye when they penned these expressions, than any rambling notions of an intermediate state. This however we are sure of, that Mr. G. has made the church say what she really does not; namely, that this joy and felicity are distinct things from the perfect consummation and bliss, she mentions afterwards.

* 1 Cor. xv. 50. † 1 Theſſ. iv. 17.

Where to look for more of the church's doctrine on this head I know not, except in the homilies; and with any thing on this subject from thence I suppose we shall hardly be pressed. However if I should be mistaken, when any doctrine there delivered shall make its appearance in favour of the adverse party, we hope we shall have leave to recruit in the same quarter, and have no fear of meeting at least with equal success.

After all, I hope none of us take the church of England to be infallible. Jokers indeed have been apt to say she is always in the right: but on this article, I have the satisfaction to inform the reader that she is not even explicit. So that if he can but prevail with his own imagination, he may betake himself to his bible with all courage, and form his opinion of this point without any fear of departing from the orthodox doctrine of the church of England, which way soever he shall find reason to determine the question.

But it was not enough for Mr. G. to overawe his audience with the authority of the church, without the addition of that dirty piece of author craft, of stigmatizing the doctrine he did not like with an heretical by-word. "The doctrine is maintained by the socinians," says he.—Why aye—and by the athanasians too, as I could shew him to his satisfaction. So far then the heretics and the orthodox are upon a level.

But does he mean that this is one of the tenets of the body of the socinians, and necessarily connected with their avowed system? So indeed it was objected to them by the faculty

of divinity at Leyden, as likewise that they denied the resurrection of the wicked: but both these one of their apologists declared to be calumnies, and appealed to a vindication of the confession of their faith, which was acknowledged for an authentic account of their doctrine by the whole sect.*

Had Mr. G. given himself the least concern to be informed concerning the principles either of professed socinians, or of those learned men to whom socinianism hath been imputed by their splenetic adversaries, he might easily have seen the impropriety of his ridiculous insinuation.

Among the latter was the great and good archbishop Tillotson, whose sermon upon the eternity of hell-torments derived upon him the title of socinian from the ——s of those days: nor indeed was it to be denied that the opinion espoused by the archbishop in that sermon was strenuously maintained by Socinus and his whole party. But then on the other hand, who more zealous for the natural immortality, and consequently the separate existence of the soul? Who more averse to, or more ready to confute the doctrine of the soul's sleeping between death and the resurrection than archbishop Tillotson?

* Bayle's Dict. Article Socinus. Rem. L. cit. 62. 63. This apologist's creed concerning the soul, is expressed in these words: *Quis non cupiat animas etiam corporibus carentes vivere, agere, intelligere; dei conspecta et gaudiis cælestibus perfrui; pro nobis, in corpore adhuc, tanquam in carcere agentibus, deum orare, nostrique curam gerere? Quis non pedibus in hanc sententiam eat?* Here then we have a socinian, the working of whose imagination is full as favourable to an intermediate state as Mr. G. himself could wish.

If Mr. G. meant nothing more by his crude assertion than to pay a compliment to one or both of the gentlemen whose opinions concerning an intermediate state appear in the appendix so often mentioned, by way of recommending them to the civilities of the mob, I cannot commend his forecast any more than his temper or his candour.

The common people are apt to take the measure of their prejudices for or against particular persons, from the esteem and repute such persons are in with such of their superiors as are by public authority set in the seat of judgment, and upon whom they will think they may, for that reason, safely depend.

When therefore it comes to be understood (as it easily may by any man upon a very little inquiry) that these two excellent persons (who never took any pains that I can hear of to conceal their peculiar opinions) have had all the marks of honour and esteem bestowed upon them by the most venerable characters in our established church, which are consistent with their respective situations; not to mention the particular and personal virtues by which their intrinsic merit is ascertained, among all those who have the happiness of a nearer acquaintance with them;—when these things, I say, come to be known and understood, and Mr. G's reflection is brought into contrast with this high degree of public estimation, what will the reasonable part of mankind conclude from the whole state of the case? Certainly either that these worthy persons are no socinians, or that socinianism is in itself a very innocent thing, and may be consistent with the

highest degrees of piety, learning, personal integrity, good sense, usefulness, and, in one word, with every thing which contributes to finish the character of a truly christian divine.

These things considered, it behoves us, I think, in prudence to be extremely cautious upon whom we cast these imputations, if it was only for the sake of our common orthodoxy. But indeed it is not from such considerations as these alone, that I would if I could discredit the infamous practice (so common among the small-craft of controversial writers) of branding men with these invidious names of arian and socinian.

For pray how come these to be terms of reproach? Only because the church, to which you have the good luck to belong, has procured a different system to be established by law. You cannot be ignorant that the arian and socinian are as firmly persuaded that your principles are void of any foundation in the scriptures, as you can possibly be that theirs are so; and if either their interest or their numbers had been sufficient to intitle them to the favour of the magistrate when the forms of religion were settled at the reformation,* perhaps by this time the names of athanasian and trinitarian had been as disreputable as arian and socinian are now.

When the papist calls you, who are a protestant, an heretic, does he prove his point?

* To prevent cavils, it may be juſt neceſſary to obſerve that Socinus, though he had not begun to figure at the time of our Engliſh reformation, only gave a patronymic to a collection of opinions which had been ſeverally maintained by various heretics long before.

Do you think he advances one step towards it? No, you laugh at him: and here in Britain you may safely do it. But if he were to call you so in Spain or Portugal, though he could only prove you a protestant, he would perhaps, in certain circumstances, frighten you sufficiently. Would then his cause gain any real merit by being under the protection of the secular arm? Or would you think his taking this advantage, either fair or generous? And is it more fair or more generous in you to call your adversary arian or socinian in England? Can you confute him out of the scriptures, the common authority to which you both appeal? If you can, take your satisfaction in good time. You have no occasion for any other weapon. If you cannot, there is no more argument, reason, christianity, common civility, or common sense, in calling a man arian or socinian, in order to render him obnoxious to the rulers of the church of England, than there is in the sanguinary papists calling you an heretic, in order to expose you to the horrid cruelties of a popish inquisition. 'Tis the same spirit, I fear, that instigates in both cases.

These insults are inexcusable in writers of any class: but most of all in those, who take refuge in this blustering abuse to screen their own weakness from the observation of their partizans. This, I am afraid, might in some measure be Mr. G's case. And as he had it in his power, and should in modesty have made it his choice to decline all attempts to clear up a point, which even his very friends

must acknowledge he neither could manage, nor sufficiently understood, his rashness and petulance in treating two eminent and unexceptionable men with so much scorn in some instances, and with so invidious and groundless an insinuation in this we have just been considering, will, it is hoped, afford some apology for the freedoms taken with him in these papers; for which indeed so much could not have been said, had he entered the lists with more candour and less self-sufficiency, though with no better appointments than this very superficial performance exhibits.

REMARKS *upon a Letter in the* Gentleman's Magazine *for* April, 1756. *Page* 173.

MY business with the writer of this letter, who calls himself *J. Ties*, is not to examine his philosophical arguments for a separate existence of the soul taken from the nature of time, &c. The consideration of these I leave to the gentleman who gave occasion to them, and who seems to be well qualified to do justice to the subject. I shall only consider the proofs brought by Mr. Ties from the scriptures in behalf of his opinion, which he allows ought to be decisive, save only in the case of the clearest demonstration to the contrary.

What kind of demonstration Mr. Ties would be willing to admit in contradiction to the scriptures he hath not said. If the scriptures determine a point of this nature, I should think it in vain to have recourse to metaphysical principles, or to rely upon any deductions from those though ever so demonstrative in a logical way, for want of sufficient data concerning the nature, substance, powers, and capacities of the human soul, considered as a principle distinct from and independent of the body. These it will ever be impossible for us to settle otherwise than by the knowledge of the actual operations of the soul in such a state of independency, which no man will pretend to on this side the grave. The demonstration then, I suppose, Mr. Ties may refer to, is intuitive demonstration, which, as it cannot be had till we have passed through a state of death! (except by some such extraordinary genius as that of Mr.

Pope,* we may as well allow the scriptures to decide the question for the present without any restriction whatsoever. And thither let us go.

St. Paul has said, 2. Cor. v. 1. *For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens.*

Mr. Ties allows that the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, is not to be received till the resurrection; "yet, says he, St. "Paul must have been very far from meaning "that the resurrection of his body would be "immediately after his death, since (in the "eighth verse of this same chapter) he expresses "his expectation both of the existence and "activity of his soul in a separate state. *We "are confident* (says he) *and willing rather to "be* absent *from the* body *and* present *with the "Lord."*

But whatever St. Paul might mean in the first verse, he was very far from meaning in the 8th any such thing as Mr. T. ascribes to him. Go back to the 6th verse, and take the context fairly along with you, and you will easily perceive the apostle is there speaking of no separate state, nor of any state after death; but of a state of *walking by faith*, and a state *of walking by sight before* death.

Therefore, says he (verse 6th) *we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord.* Now,

* In his more ferious hours he uſed to ſay---that he was certain of its immortality---that he ſeemed to feel it as it were within him by intuition. - Pope's works, vol. iv. p. 34.

if by *being at home in the body*, the apostle meant the continuance of his natural life, as that is opposed to a state of death, what occasion for all this confidence and all this knowledge? For who does not know, or who may not be confident, that to be present in this life, is to be absent from another? But, says the apostle, the reason of this confidence and knowledge is, that *we walk by faith, and not by sight*, (verse 7th.) This is something; and shews the apostle's meaning to be, that while men live in the body as if they were *at home* in it, or in other words, *walk by sight*, they are, in every sense, absent from the Lord.

But this was not the case with him and his fellow-christians, for they walked by faith; and in that faith were so stedfast, so well confirmed, so confident that (verse 8th) they were (not *willing*, but) *well pleased* (ευδοκεμεν) *rather* εκδημησαι εκ του σωματος *to be travelling from the body*, i. e. to be aliens or pilgrims in respect of bodily enjoyments; και ενδημησαι προς τον κυριον— *to be going homeward to, or towards the Lord.**

Here then we see that Paul is discoursing of no state after death, but of his spiritual life on earth; and is indeed speaking the same language (with a small variation of the metaphor [as when he and his fellow apostles talk of christians *walking not after the flesh but after the spirit*—of being *crucified unto the world —crucified with Christ—but alive unto God through Christ*—of *crucifying the flesh with*

* Hæc duo verba ενδημουντες, Εκδημουμεν, hic (viz. v. 6.) *commorationem* denotant: at v. 8 ubi commutantur, *profectionem*, says Bengelius, Gnom· in loc.

the affections and lusts—of *abstaining from fleshly lusts which war against the soul,* as being *strangers* and *pilgrims* with respect to the body, *&c.*

If this does not satisfy Mr Ties, it will be incumbent upon him to make this 8th verse consistent with what follows; for the context does not end here, but goes on thus, v. 9.

Werefore *we labour* (φιλοτιμουεθα) *that whether present* (ενδημουντες) *or absent* (εκδημουντες) *we may be accepted of him;* i. e. of the Lord.

Now nothing is more manifest in the scriptures of the new testament, than that between death and the resurrection is no state of labour. *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord,—for they rest from their labours.* But according to the apostle, he laboured, being absent as well as present.

And, therefore, if we are to understand εκδημουντες in this 9th verse, of souls in a state of separation from the body, (as we needs must, if εκδημησαι εκ τω σωματος, v. 8, mean a natural death or departure out of the body) we shall have souls in an intermediate state of probation: souls in a separate state contending with earnestness and ambition to render themselves acceptable to God; and by what means? Why, by labours and endeavours of which no account will be taken, or any inquiry made. For, as it follows immediately, the deeds for which every one shall receive his recompence, are those only which are done in the body. Is it possible to make the apostle consistent with the tenor of other scriptures, or even with himself, upon this interpretation of Mr. Ties?

But if you go along with Paul in the use of his metaphor, you will have a natural, easy sense, not only consistent with, but clearly resulting from the drift of his discourse in the foregoing part of the chapter, to this effect.

"*Wherefore we labour that whether present* "(sojourning in the body, according to the "eye of sense) *or absent* (on our pilgrimage "to our continuing city, according to the eye of faith) *we may be accepted with him*: (well "pleasing to him.) *For* (after all, we are so "far concerned with the body, that) *we must* "*all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ* "*to receive the things done in* (or through, i. e. "by the instrumentality of) *the body: accord-* "*ing to what every one hath done, whether it* "*be good or bad.*" v. 10.

Mr. Ties will now perceive, that this 8th verse will not help him out of the difficulty laid upon his hypothesis in the first. He discovers indeed, an inclination to accomodate the first verse to the notion of a separate state of the soul, by a paraphrase which leaves room for something between death and the resurrection. We will not differ with him concerning the accuracy of his paraphrase, but will suppose the Corinthians to have understood St. Paul as Mr. T. does, and thereupon to have asked him this question, "we have now an "earthly house or tabernacle of flesh, and you "tell us that at the general resurrection we shall "have a building of God eternal in the heavens: "but what shall we have in the mean time?" "Why nothing, (must the apostle have an-"swered;) you must be *naked* and *uncloathed* "till you receive your resurrection-body."

A circumstance by no means desirable, as teh apostle himself acknowledges (v. 4) be the mortal body ever so great an incumbrance: and, indeed, he excludes the very supposition of such an *uncloathed* state, by intimating that *mortality shall not be swallowed up of life*, till the resurrection-body is put on.

These considerations may likewise serve to reconcile Mr. Ties to T. J.'s interpretation of Heb. ix. 27, namely, that nothing, no active percipient state of the soul shall intervene between death and the resurrection. His objection to it indeed is little more than a quibble upon the word immediately. Allow for the interval of sleep between death and judgment, and all Mr. T's criticism on the word μετα comes to nothing. These are critical niceties of no great significance. The question bofore us must receive its decision from the current doctrine of the gospel. If Paul did not write this epistle to the Hebrews himself, we know it was written by somebody who taught the same doctrine, and is as consistent with Paul as Paul is with himself.

Mr. Ties having allowed that the death denounced upon man at the fall was not eternal punishment, we have no occasion to go along with him into his refinements on the case of Adam, or to enter with him into disquisitions, in which we think it impossible for him either to give or receive satisfaction. 'Tis sufficient for us that the punishment denounced upon our first parents is death, a state, which if there are any rules to fix the signification of words, is as different from a state of activity and perception, as darkness is from light.

" But, says this gentleman, a state of insen-
" sibility is not a state of punishment; Adam,
" upon the supposition that the moment of
" his death and the moment of his resurrection
" would appear to him the same, would be en-
" tirely insensible of his punishment till it was
" over," &c.

Mr. Ties then it seems makes no account of the accidents of mortality, the pain, sickness and sorrow to which Adam became liable, in consequence of the sentence of death passed upon him. He reckons nothing of

————the thousand natural pangs
That flesh is heir to————

which Adam in particular endured during the course of nine hundred and thirty long years, and which have heretofore been esteemed no inconsiderable ingredients of the punishment implied in the sentence of death.

" But this, we are told, or any other consi-
" deration, will not prove that the soul, du-
" ring its separation from the body, is in a tor-
" pid, inactive state, till it be first proved that
" no other state would, in this respect, be a
" punishment, the contrary of which may be
" easily shewn."

He should have said, as the course of his argument required, till it be first proved that no other state of death would be a punishment. The sentence pronounced upon fallen man was, that he should die; this death was a punishment, but, as both sides are agreed, not eternal punishment. The case standing thus, to what purpose is it to say, or even to prove, that there may be a state of perception and activity, (a state of life and not of death) which

may be as great or a greater punishment than a state of insensibility.

'Tis worth the while however, to see how Mr. T. makes out this point. "Whereas, says he, "supposing his [Adam's] soul to be sensible "and even happy in a separate state, God's de- "ferring so long the completion of its happi- "ness, cannot fail of being a real punishment." That is to say, a soul may be severely punished, and at the same time extremely happy in an intermediate state. I have some curiosity to know what Mr. G. would say to this; for this must be the case with all his good men as well as Adam. But to proceed with Mr. Ties.

"The gentleman who called himself *Philanastasis*, in the Magazine for January, 1756, observed of our Saviour's argument to the Sadducees, Luke xx. 37, 38. "That if it proved the "departed spirits of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, "to be in a state of activity and life, it would "prove too much; for God might then be "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and "yet there might be no resurrection of the "dead."

In answer to this, Mr. Ties informs us, that "no argument for a resurrection can afford a "proof of the soul's sleeping; for no person "who disbelieves a resurrection, can believe "that the soul exists after death in a torpid, "inactive state, and therefore an argument "for the resurrection, founded on such a be- "lief, must take a thing for granted which "the person it is intended to convince will "never allow."

But supposing the person intended to be convinced does not believe the separate existence of the soul at all? This we certainly know was the case with the Sadducees. And by our Saviour's leaving that disbelief of theirs untouched, and confining his argument to a resurrection only, we have sufficient reason to conclude, that he no more believed such a separate existence than they did. So that both sides being agreed as to the torpidity of the soul, or, if you please, its non-existence after death in a natural way, the argument for a resurrection had all the force and propriety that it was possible to give it.

All therefore that Mr. T's answer to Philanastasis amounts to is, that he would not have been so soon put to silence by our Saviour's argument for a resurrection as the Sadducees were, for that he could have upheld the dispute by a variety of metaphysical subtleties concerning the nature of the human soul. And to this he addresses himself in what follows.

"On the principles of the Sadducees, says "he, the resurrection is impossible, and con- "sequently a direct proof of it to them must "have been impracticable. This therefore our "Lord does not attempt——."

Amazing! our Lord's argument is plainly this. "That God is able to raise the dead "you cannot deny, that he will do it Moses "has shewn you, by recording his words at "the bush." Does our Saviour argue from any one circumstance but the power of God, and the tenor of the scriptures which the Sadducees acknowledged? And is it possible for the mind of man to conceive a more direct

argument than this to the Sadducees themselves? Would it not have been full as much to Mr. T's purpose to have observed, that upon the principles of the Sadducees, the creation of man is impossible? Where scripture facts are in question, what have we to do with visionary hypotheses?

"Our Saviour, says this gentleman, strikes "at what he knew to be the root of their [the "sadducæan] prejudice," viz. the non-existence of the soul in a separate state. Whence does this appear? Whence does it appear that this prejudice (if a prejudice it was) was not the prejudice of our Saviour as well as of the Sadducees? Without all doubt, if this prejudice had been in our Saviour's eye with a view of confuting it, he would have said, *ye do err, not knowing the nature of the human soul.* Instead of this he appeals—to what? Why to positive revelation, and the extraordinary power of God. Would not this profound abstracted philosopher be ready to tell us upon some occasions, that nothing could be more impertinent than to appeal to authority, when the question was concerning a production of nature?

"Our Saviour's argument to the Sadducees "(Luke xx. 37, 38.) if it will prove any thing, "must, Mr. Ties thinks, prove that the pa- "triarchs were in a state of activity WHEN "God appeared to Moses." And I will add, that if it proves that, it must likewise prove that they were then in a state of activity by means of a resurrection. For of any other state of activity after death our Saviour makes not the least mention; nor does he cite this

scripture to prove any thing, but that the dead are raised. If, therefore, we must adhere to the strictly literal sense in point of time, we must adhere to it throughout, that our interpretation may be all of a piece.

But why must we be so literal in point of time? "Why, if the maxims, that *one day is* "*with the Lord as a thousand years*, and, *he* "*calleth the things that are not as though they* "*were*, be applied in this case, they will be "far from proving even the future activity of "the patriarchs; since by the very same li- "cense, God's calling himself their God may "be understood to refer to his having been "such in their life-times."

Very true, if it be admitted that our Saviour was liable to be mistaken in his interpretation of what God said to Moses at the bush. For our Saviour is very clear that God did not refer to his being the God of these patriarchs in their life-times. Consequently, if we will apply these maxims in this case, it must be to the future activity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob only.

Why then, once more, must we fix this declaration of Almighty God at the bush to that point of time when it was made, rather than refer it to the future activity of the patriarchs after the resurrection? The reason comes at last, and a very curious one it is. "As God, "says this gentleman, is a relative term, and "all relation is mutual, Jehovah's calling "himself any person's God, must imply, that "that person is in a capacity for such relati- "on, that is, that he perceives and acts, or

" (as our blessed Lord expresses it) that he is " not dead but living."

So then according to this philosophy, God was not Abraham's God when Abraham was asleep; nor is the God of any man who is in the frenzy of a fever. Nay what is more, by this rule, the capacities of men to fulfil their relation towards God must, in proportion, either be as constant, uniform and invariable, as the capacities of God himself are to fulfil his relation to them, or he cannot be called their God. By which equitable sentence, infants, ideots, and numberless mortals, whose intellects are either not ripened, or have been impaired, and who perhaps have the greatest occasion for the more especial protection of God, are at once deprived of it. An absurdity which might have given the hint to a less metaphysical head, that when our Saviour says, all live unto God, he must be understood of all who had lived, or should at any time live upon earth, not those only who were already dead, but even those who were yet unborn. For they who are dead but shall rise again, and they who are yet unborn, but shall exist hereafter, are really and in fact no more incapable of fulfilling their respective relations towards God, than they whose capacities are under a temporary suspension during their natural lives. And had this gentleman given himself leave to consider that the maxim, as he calls it, which teaches that *God calleth those things which be not as though they were*, is applied by Paul not only to the quickening of the dead, but to the future privileges of the unborn posterity of Abraham, he would pro-

bably have perceived that he was only playing an hypothesis against a matter of fact, and in his zeal to save the credit of a precarious philosophy, had quite mistaken the nature of the evidence which the scriptures hold forth to believers.

"That St. Paul thought it possible, says "Mr. Ties, for the soul to perceive and act "without the body, is abundantly evident "from 2. Cor. xii. 2, 3. where speaking of his "being caught up into the third heaven, he "twice repeats these words, *whether in the "body or out of the body I cannot tell, God "knoweth.*"

Mr. Ties, as I apprehend, should have stated this case thus; "St. Paul thought it possi-"ble for the soul to be made to perceive and "to be acted upon, without the mediation of "the bodily organs, &c." For this was probably the case, not only in this, but in other prophetic visions and raptures, which are described by being in the spirit, an expression which will hardly leave room for any proper activity of the soul. We will, however, allow Mr. T. to make as much as he can of this possibility, desiring only in return, that he will pay equal regard to St. Paul in some other passages where he expresses himself with more precision, particularly 1. Cor. xv. 16—18. *If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised—then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.* (ἀπωλοντο.)

How could St. Paul say this, if he believed or even thought that the souls of these christians were alive, active and sensible, and would, in their own nature, continue so for

ever, whether they should be reunited to their bodies or not?

I have already said so much on the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19.) that I should not have thought it necessary to add any thing more, had not Mr. T. thought proper to affirm (in support of much the same arguments which Mr. Goddard builds upon it) "that "Ἅιδης always in the new testament signifies the "place or state of separate spirits."

But why in the new testament particularly, where both the name and the idea of *Hades* wherever it occurs, are most manifestly borrowed, and, in some passages, expressly cited from the old? And in the old testament is so far from being appropriated to the use of spirits, that it signifies neither more nor less than the general receptacle of the dead, without specifying any distinction of the soul from the body.

Besides; this observation of Mr. Ties, supposing it to be true, would be a very unfortunate one for his cause in another respect. Where the word *Hades* is used figuratively in the new testament, it signifies a state of utter ruin and oblivion, as particularly Matth. xi. 23, and xvi. 18. St. Peter, Acts ii. 27, quotes a passage from the 16th Psalm, where mention is made of the soul's being in *Hades*, which in the very next words is explained to be a state of corruption. For the rest, go to the old testament: David will tell you, Psalm vi. 5. that in *Hades* there is no remembrance of God. Solomon, Eccles. ix. 10. is in the same strain, and advises you to make use of your time while you are on earth, for that there is no work,

nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in *Hades*, whither you are going. King Hezekiah confirms this opinion of his predecessors, Isaiah xxxviii. 18. and informs you, that they who are in *Hades* cannot praise God nor hope for his truth. A strange place surely for active and percipient spirits, where there is no remembrance, no device [or reasoning, λογισμος] no knowledge, no hope!

It happens indeed most unluckily for Mr. T. that *Hades* cannot possibly signify or represent the state of separate spirits in this very parable; the parties concerned appearing in it with the same bodily members and sensations, as they had in their life-time.

We readily acknowledge that there are circumstances in this parable which are as little suitable to the state of things after the general resurrection, as to an intermediate state before it; particularly that part which represents some persons as still living in this world, when others are consigned to irrevocable misery. But then we say, it is a parable, composed of a mixture of images adapted to the gross conceptions of the persons for whose use and instruction it was intended: and therefore do not pretend to prove any fact, or confirm any particular point of doctrine out of it, other than the plain scope of the parable evidently suggests.

But Mr. Ties, on his side, is not willing to part with it so easily: he says, that "though "most of the things related in parables be "purely fictitious, yet they must all be possi- "ble, and in some degree, probable."

And what does he get by this observation? even this; that it is possible, and, in some degree, probable, that souls in a separate state may have bodily members, sensations and affections,—may be tormented by fire, and cooled and refreshed with water, just as when they were united to their respective bodies.

He would indeed turn his observation another way. He says, "an active, intermediate "state is the very foundation of the parable." But this is begging the question. A future state of the righteous and wicked respectively, is indeed the foundation of the parable. But whether this future state be intermediate or final, is the point in debate. This gentleman thinks he has pointed out a circumstance which makes it impossible it should represent a final state. We think we have pointed out another, which makes it full as impossible it should represent an intermediate state. But then we say, that granting both these impossibles, it is a little too hardy to call the parable absurd, because the important truths it was intended to convey, namely, the necessity of a timely and effectual repentance, and the sufficiency of the means afforded by God, under the jewish as well as the christian dispensation, for that purpose, are easily discernable by the plainest understanding through all these fictitious circumstances, which makes the literal sense impossible.

The case of the penitent thief has been sufficiently considered in the former part of this disquisition. And indeed where a man is so great a stranger to the language of the scriptures with respect to past and future times as

to be capable of saying, that "when our Sa-"viour says, *to day shalt thou be with me in* "*paradise, to day* can no more mean *two or* "*three thousand years hence*, than *paradise* "can mean *gehenna*;" the pains we have taken to rectify some other of his mistakes, may be thought by some people not to have been over well laid out.

REMARKS *upon a Paragraph in one of Archbishop* Tillotson's *Sermons.*

THE paragraph which gives occasion to these remarks is in the second of those six sermons on the subject of a religious and divine faith, preached by this worthy prelate from Heb. xi. 6. and is to be found in the eleventh volume of his works published in octavo, 1744. Serm. ccxx. p. 4892. where the archbishop having shewn how the existence of a God may be proved by the light of nature, and the reason of the thing, goes on thus:

"As for the other two principles of natural "religion, the immortality of the soul and a "future state, after we believe a God, we may "be persuaded of these from divine revelation; "and that doth give us the highest and firm- "est assurance of them in the resurrection of "Christ from the dead."

Highest and firmest assurance of THEM? Of what? Surely not of the immortality of the soul and a future state as principles of natural religion. His grace well knew that the immortality of the soul, as it is collected from the light of nature, stands upon a foundation totally different from that of a resurrection of the dead. He therefore recollects himself and goes on thus:

"Yet I do not find but that these also are "rather supposed than expressly revealed in "the bible."

Here again, if you take the word THESE to refer to immortality and a future state *assured to mankind by the resurrection of Christ*, as the connexion of the discourse plainly requires, you make the preacher not only inconsistent with himself, but guilty of a palpable untruth. Nothing can be more inconsistent than to say that the same thing is rather supposed than expressly revealed in a book which records a fact that gives us the highest and firmest assurance of that thing. Nothing more false than to say that the life and immortality brought to light by the gospel, and assured to us by the resurrection of Christ, are not expressly revealed in the bible; taking that word (as the archbishop must have done, unless you will fix upon him a contemptible quibble) for the whole of divine revelation.

Thus hath his grace twice put the change upon us (and without doubt upon himself) in the compass of a very few lines, by leading us to take THEM in the first of these periods, and THESE in the latter for relatives to the same antecedent, when indeed they refer to two very different subjects. But let us hear him out.

" Indeed the immortality of the soul [as a " principle of natural religion] may be inferred " from several places of scripture, and the " tenor of the whole bible."

Very possible. And what may not be inferred from the bible by those who, as bishop Burnet says, *will go and form systems out of some general hints?*

" And so a future state [may be inferred] " which, as for the thing itself, seems to be

" supposed [in the bible] as a thing acknow-
" ledged by natural light."

Now the tenor of the whole bible with respect to a future state, is plainly this. In the scriptures of the Old Testament (if you except those prophecies and types which signified and prefigured the redemption of man by Jesus Christ; a point confessedly out of the reach of natural light, and far enough from being understood by the ancient jews) a future state is no where supposed at all. And the sanctions of the law of Moses, being the rewards and punishments of the present life only, would naturally lead to the contrary supposition, namely, that there would be no future state.

On the other hand, in the New Testament a future state is not barely supposed, but revealed and declared with the utmost precision; and both the knowledge and the accomplishment of the thing itself made to depend upon a particular matter of fact, the resurrection of Jesus Christ; which I suppose Dr. Tillotson himself never imagined to be a dictate of natural religion.

Mark now how the archbishop represents this testimony of the gospel. He tells us, " The scripture hath only revealed the cir-
" cumstances of it [a future state] more parti-
" cularly, and given us higher assurances of
" the thing.

More particularly than what? Why more particularly, than the light of nature.—Now the light of nature puts the future existence of the human soul upon its being a principle distinct from, and, in its own nature, independent of perishable matter; and ascribes its im-

mortality to a capacity of living in a state of disunion from the body. According to natural light, if the soul had not this capacity, it would not be immortal. Whereas the scripture puts the immortality of the soul (if we must use that loose term) upon the capacity it is in of being reunited to the body after death; and not only supposes but positively asserts, that without such reunion the whole compound man will absolutely perish. 1 Cor. xv. 18.

With what propriety then, or with what truth could the archbishop say, that the scripture only reveals the circumstances of a future state more particularly than the light of nature does, when the circumstances of a future state taught by the light of nature, are declared by the scriptures to be absolutely fictitious and imaginary?

"But, it seems, if there were no revelation "men might be persuaded of these, [the im- "mortality of the soul, and a future state] and "so the heathens were by arguments drawn "partly from the operations of the soul, which "would almost persuade any man that the "soul is immortal; it being altogether uni- "maginable how a principle that is nothing "else but matter, can either understand or "determine itself by its own will, all the mo- "tions of matter that we know of, or can "imagine being necessary?"

What men *might be persuaded of*, is one thing; whether their persuasions were well grounded is quite another. If we believe revelation, these heathens were mistaken. And there were other heathens, of no less penetra-

tion, who neither drew these conclusions nor admitted these premises.

As to the argument itself, some philosophers have said, that from the operations of the soul by the mediation of bodily organs, you can determine nothing concerning the operations of the soul when divested of those organs.

Others have said, that granting the immateriality of the soul, you never can prove its immortality by that medium; since the motions of a created spirit may be as necessary as the motions of matter: and that whatever arguments you use to prove that those motions are not necessary, will equally prove the spirit to be immortal *a parte ante;* or, in other words, *uncreated* or *sempiternal;* which is more, we presume, than a christian philosopher would desire to prove concerning the human soul.

His grace goes on to some other natural principles by which men might be persuaded of the immortality of the soul and a future state, without the aid of revelation, namely, the goodness and justice of God.

"The consideration of God's goodness, says "he, would persuade a man, that as he made "all things very good, so he made them of "the longest duration they were capable of."

But if you will needs furnish nature with lights from revelation, be so fair as to lay the whole state of the case before her. If these heathens had learned so much from Moses as to know that God at the beginning made all things very good, it is great odds but they would learn so much more from him as to know, that MAN, the living soul, who came upright out of the hands of the creator, conti-

nued no long time to be very good, and that, on this very account, his duration was abridged. Without the help of Moses these heathens would see human nature in no better condition than Moses represents it to be after the fall: and from that view of man, we may well apprehend they would not be very likely to argue in favour of his duration, upon the supposition of his extraordinary goodness.

Nor is the argument for a future state, drawn from the justice of God, upon a better foundation at all. "The justice of God, ac-
"cording to his grace, would easily induce a
"man to believe, seeing the providence of
"God doth generally in this life deal pro-
"miscuously with good and bad men, that
"there shall be a day which will make a dif-
"ference, and every man shall receive accord-
"ing to his works."

That the face of the world hath indeed in general always exhibited these appearances of unequal distribution, is very true. But no body knew better than his grace, that the heathens were far from being uniform in drawing consequences from them in favour of a future state. Some of them concluded from these appearances that there were no Gods. Others, that there was no providence, or that the Gods did not at all concern themselves about human affairs. And some insisted that, notwithstanding these appearances, justice was done to every one sooner or later in this world.

With respect to the merit of the argument, men must first be in possession of the matter of fact before they can pretend to draw any certain conclusions from it; and what rule had

the heathens by which to judge who were good, and who were bad, but mere appearances?

A certain learned writer hath observed that, "there would oftentimes be the appearance of "inequality, even when and where an equal "providence was actually administered." I would desire to know how we shall determine, in any given case, that this inequality is more than appearance, now that we certainly know an equal providence is not administered? If you should take upon you to judge by such evidence as you may have from men's outward actions, professed opinions, or visible circumstances in life, who is under the displeasure of God, who is punished in this world, or who will be punished in the next, archbishop Tillotson himself will tell you, that "all such judg-"ments are rash and uncharitable, the effect "of an odious temper, and no other than a "fond persuasion that God is like yourself, "that he cannot but hate those whom you "hate, and punish those whom you will "punish."

This is likewise the language of revelation, which turns this argument of natural religion upside down, and shews that we should never be able to know that good and evil are unequally distributed in this life, if it were not revealed that there will be a future state of rewards and punishments in another. Take away the light of revelation, and God may, for ought you know, or possibly can know, administer strict justice in this world. Even revelation itself does not qualify us to judge what particular persons are for the present in a

better or worse situation than they deserve; there being numberless circumstances relating to the secret motives and intention of every man's actions; his way of estimating the good and evil of human life; the rise and progress of his associations and prejudices; the strength or weakness of his intellects; the nature of his worldly connexions; his constitution and bodily habit, &c. which may be of great weight in the sight of God, but can never come into any account that men are able to take either of his real desert and demerit, or of the measure of his happiness or misery on earth.

Thus we see this great master of reasoning perplexing himself and his readers, by confounding two things as distinct and as opposite as day and night; namely, immortality and a future state by the means of a resurrection; and immortality and a future state without a resurrection; and thereby reducing himself to the necessity of making the very same thing proveable and not proveable, most expressly and assuredly revealed in the scriptures, and yet rather supposed and taken for granted in the same scriptures than expressly revealed. With what penetration of judgment and perspicuity of language, would this great man have exposed the fallacy that runs through this paragraph, on any other subject in which his own prejudices were less interested?

It has ever been matter of some surprize to me that christian divines should lay so much stress, as some of them have done, upon these supposed lights of natural religion. When Tillotson says, that the arguments of certain heathen philosophers in proof of the immortality of the soul, *would almost persuade any man,*

&c. he is modest in comparison of others who will have them to come nothing short of demonstration. And yet nothing so plain as that this sort of demonstration cannot possibly consist with evangelical demonstration. Of this, I suppose some of our divines may heretofore have been conscious, and yet, apprehending some very strange and frightful consequences if these precious discoveries of natural light were to be given up, they were resolved to verify and realize them by some means or other. What was to be done? *Life* and *immortality as brought to light by the gospel*, left not the least room for them in that department. Nothing remained but an intermediate state. There they might thrive and subsist long enough at least for the credit and purposes of their patrons. And this, I am apt to believe, is the very consideration which has kept this unaccountable hypothesis so long on foot among protestants, and tempted them to look for some foundation for it in the scriptures, though ever so obscure and precarious.

But soft and fair. Let us consider in good time what we are doing, and what may be the consequences of our temerity.

"Amongst many things, says a leading "genius of the present age, which may be "mentioned in favour of Tillotson, this should "not be forgotten, that of those who have "passed their judgments upon him, there ne"ver was a son of absurdity who did not dis"like, or a sensible reader who did not ap"prove his writings."

Who knows but the foregoing remarks may bring us within the verge of this mortifying

sentence? Which, however it escaped him, is not of a piece with the usual temper and candour of this learned, elegant, and amiable writer.

But be it so. What remedy? The memory of Tillotson we revere as of one who in his day was in the foremost rank of good writers, and, what is better, of good men. But having done him this justice, we have a privilege of our own to plead which must not be given up upon the peril of an hard name;—the privilege of appealing from Tillotson and his whole body of admirers to the venerable christianity of the New Testament, which we presume to think worthy of an higher office than that of holding the candle to the figments of philosophy.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

JUST as the foregoing papers were finished for the press, a small pamphlet was put into my hands, intituled *Remarks upon a late treatise relating to an intermediate state*, &c. meaning Dr. Law's appendix. As the merits of this writer's scheme lie within a very little compass, it has been thought good to give it a transient review, without entering into any particulars which have fallen under our consideration already; referring such readers as desire to have full satisfaction concerning the points upon which this whole controversy turns, to an excellent tract lately published by the learned and judicious Mr. Peckard.

This remarker's hypothesis then, so far as I comprehend it, stands thus:

"Man is a compound of brute and angel. "The brutal or sensual and corporeal part of "him is, by death, separated from the angelic or the rational and moral part; which, "consisting of pure mind or spirit, lives, perceives, and acts in the same state and manner "that angels do. If this mind or spirit, after "its separation from the body, remains tinctured and polluted with that sensuality derived from the brute, it becomes diabolical, "and lives in misery, as wicked angels or devils do, and is of the same nature with them. "If it is cleansed and purified, during its union

" with the body, by the discipline of holy ha-
" bits, and the grace of the gospel, it lives in
" happiness as the holy angels do, being like-
" wise, after the death of the body, of the
" same nature with them"——" and therefore
" says this writer, where any man does in re-
" ality (and not in pretence only) believe that
" the intellectual and moral spirits of the holy
" angels can enjoy God without bodies, they
" [he] ought to allow that the intellectual
" and moral spirits of good men may do the
" same; or at least shew us (if they [he] can)
" how the former are able to do it, and not the
" latter; but that is impossible." *Remarks*, p. 7—12.

Instead of undertaking the proof of *impossibles*, we will shew him, what will answer the end just as well, that his whole hypothesis is a mere fiction, and plainly repugnant to the christian scriptures.

Our blessed Saviour tells us, that IN THE RESURRECTION *the children of God, or good men, are* AS *or* EQUAL UNTO *the angels of God in heaven.* Matth. xxii. 30. Luke xx. 36.

Whence it follows, either that there is no difference between the intermediate state of good men, and the state in which the same good men will be after the resurrection; or that good men will not be AS or EQUAL UNTO the holy angels in any state before the resurrection.

But this is not all; for it follows likewise, either that the holy angels do not enjoy God without bodies, or that good men will not be as the angels of God in the resurrection.

And here ends our debate with this extraordinary remarker; for all the use he makes of

the few scripture proofs to which he has appealed, is to twist and squeeze them into a coincidence with these imaginations concerning the angelic nature of the separate soul: which being utterly groundless, and contrary to our Saviour's doctrine, he must of course have given a mistaken sense to them all; as might easily be shewn (if it had not been done before) by descending to particulars.

What seems to have misled this author into all his misapprehension on this subject (which in some instances is truly pitiable) is the extraordinary stress he lays on a loose expression in our burial-office, importing that *the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are with* GOD, *in joy and felicity.* Upon this circumstance he builds his state of separate existence, supposing, as it should seem, that they who rise again with their bodies, will be once more incumbered with this burden of the flesh. Unmindful herein of Paul's doctrine, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God:* which is however the more excuseable, as he has likewise overlooked the consequences of once more re-uniting the brute and the angel, upon his own hypothesis.

Whereas had he considered, that the whole man will be raised incorruptible, and become wholly spiritualized at the general resurrection, he might have perceived that all his arguments for a separate or an intermediate state, whether taken from the spiritual nature of the soul, i. e. of a soul delivered from the burden of the flesh, or from the special effects and operations of the holy ghost upon such a soul, are manifestly

superseded by this doctrine of the apostle Paul, which indeed leaves not only no necessity, but even not so much as any imaginable use for an intermediate state.

But these are considerations of little weight with liturgic saints. Their principal aim is, as Mr. G. has it, *to establish the doctrine of* OUR *church*, at all events. In the prosecution of which pious design, instead of accomodating the inaccurate language of our public forms to the true meaning of scripture (as common sense, and common honesty direct in our present unreformed circumstances) they are for ever wresting the scripture to a conformity with a service composed at a time when our well meaning forefathers had but few of the lights and advantages, with respect to theological studies, which we now enjoy: not to mention the necessity they were under to let many things pass, in mere compliance with popular prejudices, and views of policy, which they could not over-rule.

If these orthodox gentlemen would be content to keep their interpretations to themselves, and for their own peculiar use, we might bear with them. We only desire to enjoy our own liberty, and should never attempt to deprive them of theirs. But when they are for cramming their notions down our throats, on the pain of being treated as revolters from our unfeigned assent and consent, &c. they must not be surprized if we make a little resistance.

The fruits of this spirit, indeed, have not always been what our zealous brethren probably expected. The engine designed to play this assent and consent upon the heterodox

only, has oftentimes recoiled upon the operator himself with double force. A misfortune to which our orthodox remarker hath unhappily exposed himself on the present occasion.

Thus if, as the remarker objects, Dr. Law in repeating the *Te Deum* declares, contrary to what he believes, that *the glorious company of the apostles are now praising God;* the remarker himself shews him the way, when a versicle or two before, *he* declares that, *all the earth doth worship God the father everlasting.* Is this true? or does the remarker believe it to be true in the strict literal sense of the words? The remarker speaks in this pamphlet of infidels and atheists; and others tell us of gross idolaters in different parts of the earth: are these to be ranked with the *worshippers of God the father everlasting?* or are we to conclude that the remarker is *self-condemned as often as he repeats this sentence to God himself, and in his own house?* And be it farther observed, that we fix this inconsistency upon him, without departing from the words of the hymn, whereas he is obliged to falsify the text, both of the *Te Deum* and the *burial-office,* before he can come at the doctor. For whatever he may think, there is a considerable difference between the glorious company, &c. *praise thee,* and, the glorious company, &c. *are now praising thee.* So likewise the office at burial, does not say, as he cites it, *so soon as* they are delivered, &c. but, *after* they are delivered, &c. A proposition, which Dr. Law may either subscribe or repeat with as much sincerity as the remarker himself, for any thing that appears in the appendix.

And yet this is the pure spiritual saint who has said nothing out of an uncharitable spirit or ill-will to any man living! This man who loads Dr. Law with the guilt of Ananias and Sapphira, for deviating, as he thinks, from his unfeigned assent and consent to certain expressions, which he himself must believe to be precarious and equivocal, by his altering the form of them before he could fix his accusation!

This man, in fine, who hath expunged from his list of true christians, every one that does not believe a doctrine, which if it was ever so true in it's self, he has taken pains to render utterly incredible to those christians who are inclined to pay more regard to the words of Jesus Christ himself, than to the systematical dreams of a superstitious churchman.

THE END.

REMARKS

ON

Dr. WARBURTON'S Account

OF THE

SENTIMENTS of the early JEWS

Concerning the SOUL:

Occasioned by

Some passages in a late book intitled,—A Free and candid Examination of the principles advanced in the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of LONDON's very elegant Sermons lately published, &c.

Scilicet, ut Turno contingat regia conjux,
Nos. animæ viles, inhumata infletaque turba,
Sternamur campis.——— VIRG.

[FIRST PRINTED, M CC LVI.]

REMARKS, &c.

WHATEVER success the ingenious author of the *Free and candid examination*, &c. may be supposed to have had in detecting and confuting the bishop of London's errors, and those of other learned men who come in for their share of reprehension in his book, there is one circumstance in his manner, which, with every unprejudiced reader, must detract from his pretensions to candor.

What I mean is an insinuation often repeated, that the principles and doctrines he undertakes to overthrow, are advanced by their respective authors in pure contradiction to Dr. Warburton.

Thus, my lord of London attacks this system of the divine legation;* Dr. Jortin affects to differ from Dr. W.† Dr. Lowth is suspected to squint at him, &c.‡

It is true, some of the writers whose opinions are here examined, have professedly opposed the divine legation; but what is that to those who have not? Turn to the passages in the several authors above mentioned, which are supposed to contain these affronts to Dr. W. and his system, and you will find no mention

* Examination, p. 24. † P. 37. ‡ P. 279.

made either of the one or the other, It is very possible to suppose some of them might be penned by men who had never heard of the divine legation or the author of it in their lives.

Among the several writers who have incurred the Examiner's displeasure, there is not one who is less to be suspected of having an evil eye to the *Divine Legation*, than the worthy Dr. Leland; but hapening to deviate from that oracle in one or two points, he is invited with a contemptuous sneer, in his next *View of deistical writings*, to clap this book [the *Examination*] into the number *. Upon what principles of common equity or common humanity will the single circumstance of differing from Dr. W. in a particular opinion, justify this petulant abuse, thrown upon the very useful labours of a pious, learned, and candid writer, whose sincerity in endeavouring to serve the common cause of christianity, is as unquestionable as that of this Examiner, or even as that of Dr. W. himself.

What is it this Examiner and his fellow-labourers would drive at? Must no man make use of his eyes or his intellects for fear of *squinting* at, or differing from Dr. W? Is every man to keep his sentiments to himself till he is sure of being in perfect accord with Dr. W?

These are hard conditions, and in some respects as hard upon the public in general as the province of authorship in particular. But what remedy? These gentlemen *will* dictate, and we *must* submit. However, next to the blessing of being quite free from a despotic go-

* Examin. P. 263.

vernment, is the comfort of knowing the utmost of its demands; and with these indeed have our taskmasters graciously condescended to make us acquainted.

Thus then stands the decree, translated out of attic irony into plain english, prescribing our demeanour towards this sovereign in the republic of letters, as we find it promulged and bearing date at the palace of Lincoln's Inn, Nov. 25, 1755.

1. You must not write on the same subject that he does.

2. You must not write against him.

3. You must not glance at his arguments even without naming him, or so much as referring to him.

4. You must not oppose his principles, though you let his arguments quite alone.

5. If you find his reasonings ever so faulty, you must not presume to furnish him with better of your own, even though you approve and are desirous to support his conclusions.

6. You must not pretend to help forward any of his arguments that happen to fall lame, and may seem to require your needful support.

7. When you design him a compliment, you must express it in full form, and with all the circumstance of panegyrical approbation, without impertinently qualifying your civilities by assigning a reason why you think he deserves them; as this might possibly be taken for an hint that you know something of the matter he is writing about, as well as himself.

8. You must never call any of his discoveries by the name of conjectures, though you allow them their full proportion of elegance,

learning, &c. for you ought to know that this capital genius never proposed any thing to the judgment of the public (though ever so new and uncommon) with diffidence, in his life.*

On these terms you may live and write what you will, or what you can, at your ease,

Bask in the sunshine of the sovereign's smiles,

and enjoy his friendship in all its *delicacy.*

In good sadness, were I in Dr. W.'s situation, I should hold myself little bound to the forward zeal and alertness of these officious allies, who, not contented with asserting to him the honour and dignity due of common right to a scholar and a genius of the first rank, are for ever arraying him in robes of mock-majesty, and heaving their cudgels at every man who will not make that sort of obeisance (not which is really due to the merit of the man, but) which they think to be due to a ridiculous phantom of their own dressing up.

Dr. W. himself indeed has handled some particular persons with severity enough, but not without first applying the lenitives of courteous admonition. Accordingly there are passages in his writings, where he hath treated the authors of some doctrines which laid cross enough upon his subject, but were not advanced in particular opposition to him, with the utmost civility and good manners; and among these authors, my lord bishop of London, if I mistake not, might be named for one.

Hence I would gladly conclude that these

* Delicacy of Friendship, pages 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 43. † Delicacy, page 28.

impetuous sallies of indignation discharged by his pretended partizans upon so many learned and worthy men, in whose writings the public can discern nothing particularly injurious or provoking to Dr. W. have not the sanction of any commission from him. I should even think that his necessary connections (if any such there be) with these heroic spirits, are not of the most easy and agreeable sort; for who would undertake to answer for the indiscretions of such kind of writers?

May one venture to ask a civil question? How come these gentlemen to take so much pains in brow-beating those who are barely supposed to squint at Dr. W. while so many others are exulting in their impunity who have stared him full in the face? Why, for example, is he left so long in the hands of that other unmerciful gentleman of Lincoln's Inn?* Or why is his sermon *on the end and nature of the Lord's supper*, still groaning under the pressure of certain sensible *remarks of a country clergyman*, which go near to prove that, in certain instances, Dr. W. is as liable to mistake the sense of Moses and Paul, as the sense of Shakespeare?

* "When a certain edition of Shakespeare appeared, (says the "facetious author of a seventh dissertation) though it had been but "the amusement of the learned editor, every body went to work in "good earnest on the great poet, and the public was presently over-"run with editions, and criticisms, and illustrations of him." P. 32. And what wonder! even the most bigoted of Dr. W's admirers are ready to allow, that he fell farther below himself in that edition than any of his adversaries durst have hoped, or could have imagined; nor indeed could any thing have put the meanest and poorest critic in so high good humour with his talents for illustrating Shakespeare, as the freedoms he saw the learned editor had taken

Methinks I hear them say, that having laid prostrate these more respectable names, the rabble of dunces must fall or fly of course; or should any of them have the assurance to keep the field, a word or two of abuse *en passant*, * or a spirited note in a new edition of the Dunciad, would do the business effectually, and rout them by whole dozens without the expence of a single argument.

But to leave these adventurers to the issue

with the great poet. Will this attic genius say that Dr. Jortin found equal encouragement to write on the same subjects with Dr. W. in other instances? That, methinks would hardly be for his master's honour. Will he say then that Dr. Jortin wanted such encouragement? Let the public judge, who have the performances of both these doctors before them. How pitiable is a man of good sense when a tyrant-passion obliges him to drudge in such dirty insinuations as this!

* "I should think my time strangely employed (says another of "Dr. W's seconds) and the reader's patience as much abused, to "take the least notice of a thing called a commentary on the book of "Alliance, in which the nameless writer has not only proclaimed his "profound ignorance of the principles of that book, but of all other "principles whatsoever, even those of his own trade, which is calum-"ny." *Exposition of the orthodox system of civil rights and church power*, p. 85. This is making short work indeed, and is a commodious and constant refuge when a more explicit answer would be inconvenient. The dunce does not understand Dr. W. which, for ought I know, may be the case of more than this commentator with respect to the principles of the Alliance. In the mean time this very commentator hath some how stumbled upon some principles which have enabled him to demonstrate that the church to which Dr. W. hath asserted the powers and privileges of allying with the state, is not the church of Christ. But what was this to the expositor and his opponents, who were only trying which of them could best vindicate our own establishment? And when matters were going so hopefully on in favour of the Alliance, for an impertinent commentator to come and spoil the sport, by appealing to the nature and genius of the christian religion, was a provocation not to be borne; and may well justify the expositor for turning upon him in a passion, and kicking him out of the dispute with a vengeance.

of their own politics, and to return to the book of examination. I have already given one specimen of the spirit of the author in the case of Dr. Leland. I shall now exhibit another, which will lead us into some inquiries of more consequence.

Among other men of worth and learning upon whom the *Examiner* hath laid violent hands, is the present master of Peterhouse, who is treated in a way so little consistent with any rules of good breeding, that the *Examiner* himself, having made some professions of candor as well as freedom in his title page, seems to be touched with some kind of consciousness that an excuse would certainly be expected for it, which he accordingly once or twice attempts, aukwardly enough, to make; hardly, I suppose, to the satisfaction of the party concerned; and perhaps not so much with a view to that, as to certain recriminations to which, in the warmth of his indignation, he had unwarily exposed his client.

For example. He opens his attack upon Dr. Law with observing that the Dr. "hath "revived the old exploded hypothesis con- "cerning the sleep of the soul." Very well, what then shall we call that hypothesis which is the reverse of the common system, or the commonly received system? Do not these terms with which he honours the hypothesis he undertakes to confute, imply that the hypothesis he would defend is as much exploded as that of Dr. Law? Possibly too it may be as old; for the *Examiner* speaking of something advanced by the bishop of London in perfect agreement with the doctrine of the *Divine le-*

gation, remarks, that "this was once sound "divinity," referring us, as appears by what follows, to a period of time when this sound divinity was in possession of the public patronage, long before Dr. W. was known to espouse it.* However, having discharged a proper quantity of spleen and resentment upon Dr. Law, he begins at the distance of near 300 pages to cool; and recollecting the possibility of having these epithets retorted upon an hypothesis for which he has a greater respect, he thus brings the matter to an amicable compromise.

"I have not, says he, called this [of *the* "*sleep of the soul*] an old exploded hypothesis, "with a design to intimate that any consider- "ations of this sort, would be sufficient to "overthrow it. Its truth or falsehood as a "scripture doctrine, must be determined by "the authority of scripture."†

Why then would this candid writer suffer these words of contempt to appear so early in his book, and to stand unqualified with this explanation for so long an interval, during which he takes more than one occasion from

* Examination, p. 118. The *Examiner* indeed having an immediate temptation to rally Dr. Jortin, varies his language, and to ſerve the preſent turn, the common ſyſtem becomes the old ſyſtem, p. 348. But the reconciliation is obvious. The ſyſtem is common in ſo far as it is patronized by the common herd, the Sherlocks, the Jortins, the Laws, the Lowths, the Benſons, the Lelands, &c. of the preſent age. But in as much as an abſolute ſovereignty in the republic of letters veſts the *Examiner's* hero with full powers to antiquate every thing he does not approve by an *ipſo facto* canon, the ſyſtem is as really and effectually old and exploded as the ſyſtem of Des Cartes.

† P. 341.

this hypothesis to wrangle with the master of Peterhouse, not without particular circumstances of scorn and contempt? Shall we borrow a solution from himself, and say, "this is only "what men call, and what critics like him "use, an expression *ad invidiam?*"*

But to come a little nearer the real merits of the cause. What is the *Examiner's* quarrel with this hypothesis of *the sleep of the soul?* or wherein, considered as a scripture doctrine, does it differ from the hypothesis of Dr. W. himself on the same subject?

Very widely, if we judge by the opprobrious names given it by the *Examiner*, who would hardly have paid so little respect to any doctrine which he so much as suspected to be honoured with Dr. W's assent and concurrence.

And yet, the account that Dr. W. gives of the sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul, has so much the very air and features of this hypothesis of Dr. Law, that I must confess the difference between them is, in my eye, next to indiscernible. And if I am in a mistake, I am sure the notice taken of this matter by the *Examiner* will by no means assist me to rectify it.

"The expression, says the *Examiner*, made "use of by David and Hezekiah, seemed so "strong and forcible, that a late learned "writer [Mr. Whiston] supposed the ancient "Jews might conceive the soul to be in a "state of inactivity during the interval be-"tween death and the resurrection."†

And does not Dr. W. suppose the very same

* Exam. P. 279. † P. 60.

thing? "The sentiments of the early Jews, "says Dr. W. concerning the soul, were like "those of the rest of mankind who have "thought upon the matter; that it survived "the body; but they simply concluded, that "it returned to him who gave it.——As to "interesting speculations concerning its state "of survivorship, it is plain they had not "any."*

The early Jews, according to Dr. W. thought that the soul survived the body. Did Mr. Whiston suppose, that the early Jews thought, that the soul did *not* survive the body? No such matter. So far then Dr. W. and Mr. Whiston are agreed. Mr. Whiston farther supposed, that the ancient Jews might conceive the soul to be [i. e. to survive the body] in a state of inactivity. Dr. W. holds, that the same Jews had no interesting speculations at all concerning the soul's state of survivorship. That is to say, they conceived the soul to survive the body in a state of inactivity. For to have conceived the soul to survive in a state of activity, would have been a speculation extremely interesting. Consequently, Dr. W's and Mr. Whiston's suppositions are exactly the same. But, *quæ conveniunt in eodem tertio, conveniunt inter se.* To prove then that the hypothesis of Dr. W. is the same with Dr. Law's, we have only to shew the agreement between Dr. Law's hypothesis and that of Mr. Whiston. And for this we appeal to the Examiner himself, who having mentioned Mr. Whiston's supposition in his text, refers from

* Div. Leg. vol. ii. edit. 2d. p. 476.

it immediately to a note which informs the reader that "the worthy master of Peterhouse "has revived *this*—hypothesis concerning the "sleep of the soul."

The *Examiner* speaks of some writers, "who "have been profligate enough to charge Dr. "W. with asserting, that the ancient Jews did "not believe the soul remained after death;" or, what I suppose is the same thing, survived the body.*

These writers I have not had the fortune to meet with, and, saving the *Examiner's* veracity, I somewhat question the fact. But that certain writers may have charged the Dr. with the consequences of that opinion, is both very credible and very accountable, without having recourse to their profligacy. For with respect to the interests or operations of the soul after death, where, I pray, is the difference between its remaining in a state of inactivity, and not remaining at all? And when a writer is considering what effect the opinions of the ancient Jews would have upon the system of the *Divine legation*, has he not just the same advantages whether the author's opinion is, that the Jews did not believe that the soul survived the body, or that they had *no interesting speculations* concerning that survivorship?

The case between the Dr. and his adversaries, so far as this question is concerned, seems to have stood thus. The contenders for the belief of a future state of reward and punishment among the Jews, have insisted that the

*Exam. p. 279.

Jews believed the immortality of the soul upon the same principles that the rest of mankind did, and consequently must upon these principles have believed a future state of reward and punishment.

The premises, for reasons best known to himself, the Dr. has thought fit to admit; but to avoid the force of the conclusion, which indeed is immediate death to his system, has asserted that the Jews had *no interesting speculations* concerning the soul's state of survivorship. To prove this, among other arguments (which shall be considered presently) he cites the authority of the preacher, Eccles. ix. 5. *The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten.* A reflection, which, if it is supposed to relate to the soul at all, plainly gives it up as absolutely lost to all the intents and purposes of action and thought.

Since then the same consequences will follow from the *no interesting speculations* of the ancient Jews concerning the state of the soul after death, as would follow from their belief that the soul did not survive the body; and since the Dr. has brought an authority from scripture to prove these *no interesting speculations*, which, if it is at all to the purpose, represents the dead person, soul as well as body, to be in a state of utter insensibility, I would desire to know wherein consists the profligacy of ascribing to the Dr. an opinion which differs not from that he professes to hold, save only in a circumstance that amounts to just nothing.

But however Dr. W. hath asserted it, as his opinion, that the early Jews thought the soul

survived the body; and he hath certainly a right to be believed that these are his real sentiments. Be this then, as he and his friends would have it. What right he has to expect that other men should espouse his sentiments is another question, and will depend upon the evidence he is able to produce that they are just and reasonable; a point, which, by his and the *Examiner's* leave, I shall now take the liberty to consider.

The whole passage in the Divine Legation from which the foregoing extract was taken, stands thus.

"It will be asked then, what were the real "sentiments of these early Jews concerning "the soul? Though the question be a little "out of time, yet, as the answer is short, I "shall not defer giving it: they were doubt- "less the same with those of the rest of man- "kind who have thought upon the matter; "that IT SURVIVED THE BODY. But having, "from Moses's silence and establishment of an- "other sanction, no expectation of future re- "wards and punishments, they simply con- "cluded that *it returned to him who gave it.* "But as to interesting speculations concern- "ing its state of survivorship, it is plain they "had not any. All this appears from the "book of Ecclesiastes, which speaks the sen- "timents of the Jews of that time: *who know-* "*eth* (says this author) *the spirit of man that* "*goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that* "*goeth downward to the earth?** And again: '*then shall the dust return to the earth as it*

* Chap. III. 21.

"*was*, AND THE SPTRIT SHALL RETURN "UNTO GOD WHO GAVE IT.* Yet this writer, "perfectly conformable to what I here deliver, "says at the same time: *but the dead know not "any thing, neither have they* any more a re- "ward, *for the memory of them is forgotten.*"†

"The sentiments of the early Jews concern- "ing the soul, we are here told, were doubt- "less the same with those of the rest of man- "kind who have thought upon the matter." Which may signify, either that these Jews conformed their sentiments concerning the soul to those of the rest of mankind by mere tradition, and without more ado, or that they came to the same conclusions by the deductions of their own reason and reflection. But doubtless the rest of mankind held (not simply that the soul survived the body, without having any interesting speculations concerning its state of survivorship, but) that the soul survived the body in order to receive reward or punishment in a state of separate existence. This the Jews, according to Dr. W. did not believe; and if you ask what hindered them? The Dr. tells you, that "Moses being silent "concerning a future state of reward and pu- "nishment, and having established another "sanction, the Jews had no expectation of a "future state of retribution." That is, in plain terms, the Jews paid so much regard to what Moses had established, as well as to what he omitted to establish, as to conclude that the rest of mankind were mistaken in the inference they drew from the doctrine of the soul's immortality.

* Chap. XII. 7. † Chap. IX. 5. Divine Legation, *ubi supra*.

You go on then, and you ask, why did not the Jews reject the principle upon which the inference was grounded, since to all appearance they had the very same inducement so far as they regarded Moses, to reject them both? Did Moses deny the doctrine of future rewards and punishments? Or did he proclaim the doctrine of the immortality of the soul? No, he was only silent, as silent as he could be concerning them both. Silent concerning a future state of reward and punishment, lest that doctrine should revolt them against his system of laws which were established upon another sanction; and silent concerning the immortality or separate existence of the soul, because that doctrine was preparatory, or immediately led to the other; that is, to the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment. Why then did not the authority of Moses prevail in the one case as well as the other? Why did the Jews fall in with the sentiments of the rest of mankind on one of these points and not on the other?

Dr. Warburton, indeed, speaks of something which Moses was necessitated to mention, from whence the Jews would of course infer the separate existence of the soul.* But to say that Moses was necessitated to mention this matter, is saying that Moses would have concealed it if he could. And accordingly when we come to consider this case, we shall find that, in the opinion of Dr. W. Moses delivered himself with the utmost obscurity concerning it.

* Divine Leg. p. 483.

If then the Jews were so ready to reason, and infer in a case where they had no encouragement from Moses, and that from a narrative delivered in very obscure terms ; what hindered them from reasoning and infering in a case where Moses was barely silent, and where they were led to reason, and infer by the nature of the thing, and without any obscurity to perplex them?

If Dr. W. should say that the temporal sanction upon which the Mosaic institute was established did not so immediately affect the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, we would ask whether the establishment of temporal rewards and punishments, was in the nature of the thing, inconsistent with the doctrine of future rewards and punishments ? If not, the Jews, by the silence of Moses, were left as free either to adopt the doctrine of future rewards and punishments from popular tradition, or to infer it from the nature of the thing, as to adopt or infer the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

It will not be denied that the sentiments which the Jews derived from Moses, and the sentiments which they derived from other fountains of knowledge, stood upon very different foundations. The circumstances of this difference afford a sufficient proof that the Jews would conform themselves to the teaching of Moses preferably to any other sort of instruction. Moses used his utmost endeavours, as far as was consistent with truth, to conceal the doctrine of the immortality or the separate existence of the soul, as well as the doctrine of fu-

ture rewards and punishments. The rest of mankind held and taught them both. And they both laid equally obvious to the reasonings and inferences of the Jews, and were both equally uncontradicted by any thing delivered in the writings of Moses. And yet the Jews adopted the one doctrine, and rejected the other. This is the case of which we desire a clear and consistent account, and concerning which, we humbly presume, Dr. W. hath as yet given us no competent satisfaction.

But, however, as we have some records still remaining, which exhibit the sentiments of the Jews on many interesting subjects of religion, it is highly proper to settle the matter of fact in the first place; and to find out if we can, whether they did or did not believe the doctrine in question, before we proceed to inquire into the reasons either why they believed it, or why they rejected it.

To prove that the early Jews thought that the soul survived the body, Dr. W. cites first, Eccles. iii. 21, *who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, or the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth.*

To bring this text home to the point, it is intended to prove, two things must be presupposed: 1. That by *spirit* the preacher means *the soul*, in the same sense wherein that word is commonly used. 2. That by *going upwards* he means to denote its *state* of *survivorship*, in opposition to *going downwards to the earth*; which, in this case, must mean that the soul of the beast dies with its body.

Now, whether Dr. W. is right in his interpretation of this passage or not, must be de-

termined by the foregoing context, with which this verse is immediately connected.

The preacher's whole reflection on this subject, in this chapter begins at the eighteenth verse, and goes on thus.

I said in my heart, concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth *the sons of men*, befalleth *beasts, even* one thing befalleth them; as the one *dieth*, so *dieth the other, yea* they have all one breath, [or spirit] *so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All* go *unto* one place, *all are dust, and all turn to dust again.*

Thus far, I suppose, every reader of common sense will perceive that the purpose of the preacher is to prove, that a man hath no preeminence above a beast; for that both have one common breath or spirit, both go to one common dust, and with respect to their end, or the consummation of their being, one thing befalleth them both. That is, in plain words, man and beast after death, are upon an equal footing. And immediately after this follow the words, *who knoweth the spirit of man which goeth upwards ?* &c.

Now, if you give these words the only sense in which they can be pertinent to Dr. W's purpose, you make this writer to say, that man and beast are not upon an equal footing after death, but that man hath a considerable preeminence above the beast in the survivorship of his soul; which is fixing upon him so glaring a contradiction in the continuation of the

same argument, as would for ever discredit his evidence upon any subject whatever.

Whereas, take the word *spirit* or *breath* in the 21st verse, for the same *spirit* or *breath* that is mentioned v. 19th (and it is the same word in the original in both places) and you will find this writer perfectly consistent with himself. For having said before that men and beasts have all one breath, he goes on here to prove it by an argument *ad ignorantiam.* For *who,* says he, *knows* [the difference between] *the spirit* [or *breath*] *of man that goeth upward* [i. e. is breathed from an erect figure] *and the spirit or breath of the beast, which goeth* [or is breathed] *downward to the earth?*

Dr. W. I suppose, imagined that the preacher, by *the spirit that goeth upward,* &c. intended to mark some difference between man and beast *after* death; whereas the difference pointed to, was a difference *before* death; the same difference noted in that well-known passage of the latin poet,

Pronaque cum spectent animalia cætera terram
Os homini *sublime dedit cælumque tueri*
Jussit.

And the case was plainly this.

To the foregoing conclusions for the indiscriminate fate of man and beast, it was very natural to object the apparent advantages that man had over the beasts in his life time, of which the comely and upright figure of his body is not the least considerable. This the preacher obviates, by saying that for any thing any man can possibly discover, it is one and the same breath or spirit which ani-

mates all living creatures, whether breathed out of the upright body of a man, and so ascending upwards towards heaven; or breathed from the nostrils of the beast which gave it a more immediate direction towards the earth.

'Tis the same *spirit* or *breath* likewise that is mentioned, *Chap.* xii. 7. *Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.* Indeed the preacher is here considering the final dissolution of the human frame only; but still allotting the same common fate to the whole species. For as it is the same common dust which shall return to the earth as it was; so is it the same common spirit or breath which shall return unto God who gave it;—the spirit or breath of life, which God at the first breathed into the nostrils of man, and which we may venture to pronounce on the authority of Dr. W. himself has no relation to the immortal soul.*

But supposing these texts to have been ever so clear and express for Dr. W's purpose, is he quite fair in referring us to the writer of the book of Ecclesiastes, for the sentiments of the early Jews? By the early Jews we naturally understand the Jews who lived under the Mosaic dispensation during the first ages after its promulgation. By what period we should limit the denomination, early Jews, in the present case, Dr. W. himself seems to instruct us, when he says, that, "all texts brought to "prove the knowledge of a future state of re-

* Div. Leg. Vol. II. p. 556.

" ward and punishment among the Jews after " the time of David, are utterly impertinent."*

If then the Jews might come at the knowledge of future rewards and punishments AFTER the time of David, although this doctrine was not in the law of Moses, and, for that reason, had been unknown, or not believed for so many ages BEFORE; why might not that be the case likewise with the doctrine of the immortality or the separate existence of the soul? The Dr. brings but one single passage from the writings of Moses, to shew that the Jews might infer that doctrine from any thing Moses had said. Others, indeed, have brought more, and these seemingly much more likely to lay a foundation for the belief of a separate existence, than the text referred to by Dr. W. What says the Dr. to these texts? He examines them one by one, and shews that the learned men who make this use of them are mistaken. Nay more, the Dr. will not allow that the early Jews were at all enlightened concerning the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, by that very text in Exodus which, he himself tells us, our Saviour brought to prove this doctrine to the Sadducees.

Since then, according to Dr. W. there is but one single passage in the old Testament, before we come to the book of Ecclesiastes, which could give the Jews any hint of a separate existence of the soul; and that passage a very obscure one, and leading to this doctrine, as one would imagine, only by a remote inference, may we not with some reason con-

* Div. Leg. u. s. p. 482.

clude, that, for ought that appears, the doctrine of immortality, or the separate existence of the soul was as much and as long a secret to the Jews, as the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment, and both for the same reason, namely, because neither of them was taught by Moses?

But this is not all. We object to the authority of this same Ecclesiastes on another account. Dr. W. says above that he speaks the sentiments of the Jews of that time.

So, it seems, supposed Dr. Sykes, and in the simplicity of that supposition, cited from this book some sentiments which were far from being such sentiments as Dr. W. had ascribed to the Jews upon a certain point, then in agitation between these two learned doctors.

What does the reader imagine was Dr. W's refuge? These sentiments were too plain to be denied, and too often repeated to be misrepresented by an arbitrary paraphrase, or evaded by an ingenious criticism upon words. To work then the respondent goes with the whole book; and shews, "that Dr. Sykes was "not aware of the nature, the general plan "and purpose of it."——"That it was not "unusual for Solomon to personate the garb "and manners of the gentile sages.—That "he puts on such a personated character in "this book.—That in consequence of this, "there are propositions in it that are not true "with respect to the chosen nation.—That "sometimes he returns to his real character of "a Jew.—That upon this account there are "several contradictory passages in the book,

"which cannot be reconciled but by suppo-
"sing that there he speaks of the state of
"mankind in general, and here of the jewish
"nation in particular.—In several places of
"the book an equal providence is asserted,
"in several others, an unequal, &c. &c. &c."
In one word, and to bring this matter home to our own occasions, two of the citations brought in the passage we have transcribed above from the Divine Legation; the one to prove that the early Jews thought the soul survived the body; the other to prove that the Jews had no interesting speculations concerning the soul's state of survivorship, are, in Dr. W's own account, delivered by the preacher in his personated character, and are consequently, the sentiments (not of the early Jews, but) of a gentile-sage.*

Whatever may be thought of this practising upon the scriptures till they are made to speak all that a controversial crisis may demand, I shall forbear to give it a name, and only take leave to conclude from this remarkable instance of it, that Dr. W. hath failed in his attempt to prove that the early Jews believed the soul survived the body, so far as he relied upon the evidence of the preacher, whether in his real or his personated character.

Let us now look forward to another passage of the Divine Legation.

"As to the doctrine of the separate exist-
"ence of the soul, (says Dr. Warburton) we
"should distinguish between the mention of
"it by Moses, and following writers. They

* Dr. Warburtons Remarks on several occasional reflections. Part II. p. 203—211.

" [the following writers] might, and, as we " have shewn, did draw this conclusion from " the nature of the thing.*

In what manner Moses mentioned this doctrine will be considered in its place. In the mean time, the distinction recommended to us in this passage imports, that these following writers drew this conclusion from the nature of the thing, independently of any authority from, or regard to Moses.

Where Dr. W. hath shewn that the following writers drew this conclusion at all, if not in the passage cited above, I am utterly ignorant. And there the preacher (the only evidence he hath called) putting on the garb of a pagan philosopher, must, for that season, lay aside the mantle of Moses, and play a part wherein both the scenery and the sentiments are of another complexion.

Upon another occasion Dr. W. says, " one " might fairly conclude, that the people's not " having the doctrine of a future state of re- " ward and punishment, was a necessary con- " sequence of Moses's not teaching it, because " the law solemnly forbids the least addition to " the written institution."†

Here all the stores and all the sources of jewish knowledge and learning are confined within the law of Moses ; and we are, by these circumstances, at liberty to conclude, as well with respect to the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, as the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment, that in so far as Moses taught it not, the Jews had it not.

* Div. Leg. p. 483. † Div. Leg. p. 463.

And the matter of wonder is, why the Jews should have, or why they should take the liberty to ramble out of the limits of the law, to the nature of the thing in the one case, and not in the other.

But however it seems, they did it; and we now learn how the Jews came to conform their sentiments concerning the soul to those of the rest of mankind; namely, they reasoned upon, and concluded from the nature of things, as the rest of mankind did, that the soul survived the body.

Our next business then will be to consider, how the rest of mankind reasoned and concluded on this subject, and whether the Jews were at liberty to reason and conclude in the same manner, without any obstacle or interference arising from the doctrines and circumstances of their own law.

The arguments made use of by the rest of mankind to prove the immortality, or the separate existence of the soul, were of two kinds, moral and metaphysical.

The moralist reasoned thus. "An unequal "distribution in this world,—therefore a fu- "ture state of reward and punishment,---there- "fore an immortal soul."

If then, the Jew uninfluenced by the doctrine of Moses, concluded from the nature of the thing THIS WAY, that the soul survived the body, he must likewise have believed a future state of reward and punishment, as the final cause of that survivance. But if, on the other hand, the nature of the sanction established by Moses, and the administration of an equal providence within his own department,

would prevent his expectation of future reward and punishment, the same circumstances would likewise prevent his belief of the immortality, or the separate existence of the soul; because, in those circumstances, he could give himself no moral reason for it. And the result would be, that his pagan neighbours were mistaken in the one conclusion as well as the other.

The metaphysician went another way to work. He argued for the immortality or separate existence of the soul, from its nature and properties in the abstract; namely, its active and self-moving powers, its immateriality, &c. and employed in his conclusions, many definitions and axioms concerning the nature of spirit as contradistinguished from body, which were far from being obvious to vulgar understandings, and of which the populace among mankind would have no comprehension.

Among other reasons that are given why the spiritual part of the Mosaic law was secreted from the people of the Jews under a carnal cover, one is, that they were a people of gross and carnal minds, unapt to conceive, or to be influenced by spiritual motives or considerations of any kind.

Is it credible then, that this people should enter into the principles of a science, and the refinements of a philosophy, which was ten times harder to understand than the explanation of their own types would have been? Or, if they had either capacity or inclination to have speculated so far in these principles, as to convince themselves of the separate existence of the soul, is it possible to conceive that they should not speculate so much farther, as to con-

sider the *interest* the soul had in its *state of survivorship?* Or, lastly, is it credible that a man who had gone through these scholastic reasonings on the nature of the soul, and by those means had found out that it survived the body, and remained after death in full possession of its vital, active and perceptive powers,---is it credible, I say, that such a man should ever bring himself to pronounce that *the dead* KNOW *not any thing* and that *there is no* WORK, nor DEVICE *nor* KNOWLEDGE, *nor* WISDOM in *Hades?**

It is here quite immaterial whether you take the preacher in his real or his personated character, as his conclusions are directly opposite

* Eccles. ix. 5. 10. Dr. W. hath indeed told us, (i. e. hath aſſerted) that "*Hades* in the old teſtament ſignified the receptacle of "dead bodies; in the new, the receptacle of living ſouls." (Div. Leg. u. s. p. 466.) And hereupon takes occaſion to ſneer at Mr. Whiſton, who, not aware of this curious diſtinction, probably thought, as every ſenſible man who has examined into the fact, muſt think, that the writers of the new teſtament, having taken both the name and the idea of the thing from the old, would hardly uſe the word in a different ſignification. What that ſignification really was, is another queſtion. If the writers of the old teſtament uſed *Hades* in that ſenſe *only* Dr. W. ſays they did, how will it follow from a text which ſhews only what was thought of the dead body, that the writer made no intereſting ſpeculations on the living ſoul? All you can conclude in that caſe is, that the writer thought the dead bodies of men know not any thing, have no reward, &c. Notwithſtanding which, he might ſtill think that the ſeparate ſoul was active, ſenſible, and capable of reward. Or if you will needs conclude any thing from his ſilence on the ſubject of the ſoul, it can only be that he made no ſpeculations at all upon it; in other words, that he had no conception that the ſoul ſurvived the body in any ſtate whatſoever. If it ſhould be objected to this that the preacher, Eccles. ix. 5. meant the dead perſon, I will not diſpute it, but only remind the objector that in the language of the old teſtament οἱ τεθνηκοτες and οἱ ἐν ᾅδῃ are equivalent expreſſions. See Iſai. xxxviii. 18.

to those which, according to Dr. W. either Jew or Gentile would draw from the nature of the thing.

It appears then upon the whole, that the Jews neither did, nor, in their circumstances, could conclude from the nature of the thing, that the soul survived the body, without concluding from the same nature of the same thing, that there would be a future state of reward and punishment; the consideration of Moses's establishment having an equal influence upon both principles, at least with regard to the moral use of them, to which the Jews would certainly have respect.

The Doctor goes on.

"But Moses, who we suppose intentionally omitted the mention of a future state of reward and punishment, we must needs suppose too would not proclaim the preparatory doctrine of the separate existence of the soul; nor could he, on the other hand, deny what he knew to be the truth."

"Moses would not proclaim the doctrine of a separate existence of the soul." Pray how far short was it of a proclamation to make mention of this doctrine in a public writing which was to be read in the ears of all the people, the contents of which parents were to teach their children with the utmost assiduity, and to which every Jew was required to pay the greatest regard?

But why would not Moses proclaim this doctrine? Because says the Dr. it was a doctrine preparatory to the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. But what occasion for all this shyness in Moses, if the Jews both might

and did infer this doctrine from the nature of the thing? Was not Moses aware of this? Would not the inference by the way of the nature of the thing, if they were permitted to draw it without contradiction from Moses, as effectually prepare them for the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment, as if Moses himself had taught the separate existence? By Dr. W's state of the case it appears that Moses was apprehensive, if the Jews were once in possession of the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, they would go on and infer the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment. It appears likewise from the same state of the case, that Moses did not rely upon his having established another sanction, as a sufficient barrier against this second infe rence. When therefore we are informed by Dr. W. that there were two ways, by which the Jews would unavoidably come at the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, we are greatly at a loss to conceive by what contrivance Moses would prevent this people who were so prone to reason, and infer, from building the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment upon it. For Moses could no more deny what he knew to be the truth in the one case than in the other.

Ay, but, says Dr. W. "if the Jews had this "doctrine [of a future state of reward and "punishment] they MUST NEEDS have it, "not as a conclusion of natural reason, but as "revealed."*

* Div. Leg. p. 476.

Must needs have it;—that is, they could not have it any other way than by revelation.

This indeed might have made Moses perfectly easy and secure concerning the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul. Let the Jews come by this doctrine in what way you will, there they must stop. They could go no farther without Moses; for all their revealed doctrines were delivered by him only.

But if this was really the case, why should Moses be so exremely cautious and reserved concerning the doctrine of the separate existence? Why might he not proclaim that as loud as he could? Why was he so careful to avoid the mention of it, except in one particular instance where he was necessitated so to do?

But this is not all. We desire to be informed, how it was possible for the Jews to have the preparatory doctrine of the separate existence of the soul as a conclusion of natural reason, or by way of inference from the nature of the thing, and impossible for them to have the doctrine to which it was preparatory otherwise than by revelation?

Again. Dr. W. calls the doctrine of the separate existence, the preparatory doctrine to that of a *future state of reward and punishment.* This latter doctrine, he says, the Jews could have no otherwise than by revelation. And he adds, "that if Moses were indeed God's "messenger, and would teach a future state, "it could be no other than the christian doc-"trine of it."*

Hence arises another difficulty; namely, in

* Div. Leg. p. 476.

what sense can the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul be called, or by what logical deduction can it be shewn to be preparatory to the christian doctrine of a future state?

The learned Dr. speaks of some "who never "rightly distinguished between a future state "as taught by what men call natural religion, "and a future state as taught by christian re-"velation.*

Here the Dr. seems to me to point to a real, not a nominal difference between these doctrines; that is to say, to a difference which implies more than that the one doctrine is revealed, and the other a conclusion of natural reason. For these may be the conditions of one and the same doctrine.

Let us try then, if we can find out some of the circumstances of this real difference.

A future state, as taught by what men call natural religion, supposes the soul to be susceptible of happiness and misery, and consequently of reward and punishment, without the participation of the body. And of this future state, the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul is indeed the basis, or the preparatory doctrine.

But a future state, as taught by christian revelation, is a future state into which the entrance is by the door of a resurrection of the body; a future state in which men are placed by an immediate act of the power and will of God manifested in a particular dispensation; a future state which stands, as to the mode of it, independent of any principles of natural

* Ibid p. 479.

religion; and which may be accomplished whether the soul survive the natural death of the body or not.

Now this latter is the future state which Moses is said not to have disbelieved; * and which he must have taught (if he would teach a future state at all) exclusive of any other doctrine of it.

The question then is, how the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul can be preparatory to the doctrine of a future state by the way of a resurrection? Or, in other words, how the doctrine of a future state, of which the resurrection of the body is an indispensible condition, can be built upon the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul.

Lay the doctrine of the resurrection out of the question, and then indeed, to have even a competent idea of a future state, you must be prepared by the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul. But take in the resurrection of the body, and the doctrine of a separate existence is of no consequence. There may be a future state without it.

We conclude then, that that doctrine of a future state to which the doctrine of the separate existence is preparatory or fundamental, either is not the doctrine of a future state which Moses must have taught, and did not disbelieve, or that Moses did not disbelieve two future states, the one as taught by natural religion, the other as taught by christian revelation. And two they must be if the Dr. would keep clear of his own reprehension, and does

* D. L. p. 48 1.

not hold as some of his opponents are said to do, namely, "that the only difference between "the christian and the general doctrine of a "future state is, that the christian doctrine "was revealed, and the other a conclusion of "natural reason."*

But to do Dr. W. justice, he does not seem at all disposed to trifle with us on this occasion. He frankly owns, "that he himself holds "the general and the christian doctrine of a "future state to be very different things." Different in other respects, we suppose, than those just mentioned. Things, as we understand him, between which there is a specific difference. For, he says, "if Moses were in-"deed God's messenger, and would teach a "future state, it could be no other than the "christian doctrine of it."†

* D. L. p. 476.

† To talk of a specific difference between a general and a particular doctrine on the same subject, is, we own, hardly sense. But as the Dr. is in this place a little oracular, and reserves the explanation of his full meaning to some future time, we find ourselves obliged for the present, to accommodate our language to the apparent signification of the Dr's. own terms. In the mean time, we are indebted to the free and candid Examiner, for pointing out to us another circumstance of difference between these two doctrines of a future state held by Dr. W. as follows. "A future state taught by revelation, is not "immediately founded on the same principle with that taught by na-"tural religion. The latter stands immediately on this principle, "that God is just, and will give to every man according to his works; "therefore, if the distribution of good and evil be not made here, it "will be hereafter. But the future state of revelation stands only "mediately, on this, and immediately on its being a restoration to a "lost inheritance, purchased by a redeemer." See Fr. and cand. examin. p. 69. This indeed is more than we find in the *Divine Legation*, but does not however exhibit the distinction we are looking for, which is a distinction or a difference that would preclude Moses

For any thing then that yet appears, Moses might believe every tittle and circumstance of the christian doctrine of a future state, and yet hold the separate existence of the soul, and the doctrine of a future state founded thereon, to be mere dreams and fables, or rather indeed, without having the least conception of a separate existence at all.

But however, if after all we have said or can say, Moses did indeed make mention of the separate existence of the soul, so as to be understood to affirm it, we shall take this for very

from teaching ANY OTHER than the christian doctrine of a future state. Whereas, for any thing contained in this distinction, Moses very consistently might, and indeed if he would teach any, must have taught both these future states, or if you please both these doctrines of a future state; in as much as the future state of christianity is founded upon both these principles. But the doctrine of a future state we are now comparing with the christian doctrine, is that doctrine of it to which the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul is preparatory; and which must differ as much from the general doctrine, or the future state taught by natural religion above-mentioned, as the christian itself does: that is, as much as any particular doctrine differs from the general doctrine on the same subject. For example. A "future state as taught by Plato is not immediately founded on the "same principle with that taught by natural religion. The latter "stands immediately on this principle, that God is just, &c. But "the Platonic future state stands only mediately on this, and im-"mediately on the natural immortality of the soul." Here 'tis plain that the doctrine of a future state, to which the doctrine of the immortality or separate existence of the soul is preparatory, is no more implied in the general doctrine of a future state taught by natural religion, than the christian doctrine is. On the other hand, there is, between these two particular doctrines, a specific difference: A difference as we apprehend which even upon Dr. W's state of the matter, would have precluded Moses, not only from teaching, but from believing them both. For what is this lost inheritance but life and immortality? And what occasion to be restored to that by purchase, which mankind already have by nature?

sufficient evidence that the early Jews believed it; and, in that case, shall be very well contented to have all our presumptive arguments to the contrary go for nothing.

Dr. W's account then of this matter is, that "Moses, being necessitated to speak of "Enoch's translation, it could not be but that "a separate existence might be inferred, how "obscurely soever the story was delivered."*

That is to say, it could not be but that a separate existence of the soul might be inferred, from an incident where the soul was never separated from the body at all; but where the soul and body went out of this present life in the strictest union! Was it possible the learned doctor could be serious while he was conceiving this extraordinary inference?

All the world have hitherto held, that the separate state of the soul commences not till the death of the body; but Enoch was translated *that he should not see death.*† The consequence is, that the separate existence of Enoch's soul never commenced at all. For translation separates nothing, but the whole living man from his earthly nature and connections.

Surely an instance of this kind, instead of giving rise to the doctrine of the separate existence, was enough to confound and explode it, if it was ever so common.

It might indeed be obvious to infer from the case of Enoch, that there was some invisible state where both soul and body, or the compound man, would hereafter exist. But no

* D. L. u. s. p. 483. † Heb. xi. 5.

man who had not an interest in the inference independent of truth and common sense, would ever think of infering from Enoch's translation that there was a state where the soul existed alone.

What a remarkable contrast have we here of genius and hebetude in the composition of these same Jews? It could not be but that they might infer a separate existence of the soul, from a narrative delivered in a studied obscurity of expression, and which, if it had been related in the plainest and most diffusive language, would neither have mentioned nor implied any such thing; and yet, being in possession of this doctrine, they could not infer from it another doctrine, to which it was preparatory; to which the transition was easy, plain, open and unobstructed by any circumstance of obscurity whatever; in one word, another doctrine, without which the doctrine of the separate existence, was of no sort of use or significance!

Again. Enoch, by his translation, was put into those circumstances in which (as we now learn from the christian doctrine of a future state) all good men will be found at the resurrection; and this was the very future state which Moses is supposed not to disbelieve. Can any thing be more preposterous than to suppose that the Jews would infer the preparatory doctrine of a separate existence and *no more*, from an instance, wherein the doctrine of a future state of reward for good men was actually exemplified? Was there ever an instance where the foundation was infered from the superstructure, at the same time that they

who made the inference had not the least idea of the superstructure at all?

Here, I suppose, Dr. W. will endeavour to avail himself of the studied obscurity, with which, he says, Moses delivered this story. Well then, did this obscurity mislead the Jews into a wrong inference? Will Dr. W. say this? I apprehend not. His meaning appears only to be, that though the Jews would infer some part of the truth from this narrative, yet that Moses's obscurity would prevent them from infering all the truth which the story, nakedly and plainly told, would have imported.

We allow this to be a very possible case: but, be the doctrine of the separate existence as firm a truth as you please in itself, we cannot allow that the Jews, or any other people, would infer a doctrine from this narrative, which the matter of fact related in it did not at all import; and allow at the same time that the inference was right.

But after all, why all this stress laid upon the obscurity of the narrative? Or whence does it appear that Moses really obscured it of set purpose? All Dr. W's efforts to shew this, amount to no more than that Elijah's translation was attended with more conspicuous and astonishing appearances than that of Enoch; and what wonder that it should be related in a more circumstantial manner? Is it of the nature of a translation that it should be effected with precisely the same circumstances that happened in the case of Elijah? If so, Paul is extremely short and obscure in his description of another translation, namely of those *who shall be alive and remain* at the coming of

Christ. Of these he says, that *they shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.* "How unlike the relation of the same "case in Elijah!"

But to consider this story of Enoch more particularly. In what circumstance is it defective, which was proper to give the readers of Moses a competent account of what really did happen to Enoch? Or by what circumstance does it appear that Moses knew one tittle more of the matter than he related?

And Enoch walked with God. Is there any obscurity in this expression? No. It is Moses's common language for a pious and a righteous man. It is the very character he gives of Noah in the next chapter.

And he was not. What might the early Jews understand by this? Why possibly indeed that Enoch was annihilated—if Moses had not immediately added a sufficient explanation.

For God took him. Took him undoubtedly, by some way in which no other man ever had been taken. No man before or after Enoch, to the times that Moses wrote his history, was ever taken without leaving some remains behind him. The consequence was obvious; Enoch was taken by God from the face of the earth while he was yet alive.

It is true, the early Jews would be far from comprehending all that was implied in the expression, God took him, as it is now explained to us by the light of the christian revelation. And how far Moses was himself instructed on this head, is a problem into the solution of which I shall not enter.

But whatever Aben Ezra, Solomon Jarchi, Mr. le Clerc, or Dr. Warburton might immagine, Moses was explicit enough to be well understood by the Jews, long before this passage could receive any additional light from the doctrines of christianity.

The literal English of the version of the LXX is this : *And Enoch pleased God, and was not found, beeause God translated him.* In which sense this version is followed by the authors of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus.** And that it is the true sense of Moses, we have the indisputable testimony of the writer to the Hebrews.†

Now we have not only no obscurity here, but, what is worse for Dr. W's inference, it is plain that these Jewish writers understood this translation of Enoch in the light of a REWARD for his *pleasing God.* A circumstance which could hardly be overlooked by the earliest readers of Moses's history, as Moses himself had twice made mention of Enoch's *pleasing God.*

And Enoch pleased or *walked with God* after *he begat Methuselah, three hundred years.* A long and faithful perseverance in the paths of piety and righteousness ! and was what undoubtedly gave occasion to the epistle to the Hebrews to say, that *Enoch* BEFORE *he was translated had this* testimony, *that he pleased God.*

When therefore this testimony was again repeated, and immediately connected with an account of his translation, was it possible for

* Wisd. iv. 10. Ecclus, xliv. 16. † Heb. x. 5.

the most stupid Jew that ever lived not to see that this translation happened in consequence of Enoch's pleasing God ? or in Dr. W's phraseology, not to have some *interesting speculations* concerning that state to which Enoch was taken or translated ?

If we should grant, therefore, that the general doctrine of a separate existence for all mens souls, was what, and what only the ancient Jews would infer from this case of Enoch, we see the very nature and circumstances of the case itself must have suggested to them, that every man's soul would be happy or miserable in that state of separation, according as he had walked or not walked with, pleased or not pleased God in this present life.

Be all this however as it would, whatever use the Jews might make of this story, Moses, it seems, was necessitated to mention it, and we must suppose he would manage as well as he could. " But, says the Dr. had the words " in his account of man's creation, that *he* " *was created in the image of God*, and that " *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of* " *life*, literally signified the *immortality of the* " *soul* ; then must Moses be supposed, pur- " posely to have inculcated that immortality ; " contrary to what we hold, that he purposely " omitted the doctrine built upon it, namely, " a future state of reward and punishment."

An attentive reader, of the Divine Legation must needs have observed, that Moses is there represented as a lawgiver of consummate learning, policy and prudence ; a great adept in the knowledge of mankind ; perfectly well acquainted with the genius, interests and ne-

cessities of the people over whom he presided; and particularly happy in applying, his talents for legislation to their particular occasions.

And yet, what a different figure does he make when we consider these particular instances of his sagacity, and of the measures he took to bring his purpose to bear?

Moses would not proclaim nor purposely inculcate the doctrine of the immortality or separate existence of the soul. Why so? Was it not sound and true doctrine? Yes; but for certain reasons, he found it expedient to conceal this doctrine from the people of the Jews.

What was the consequence? Why the people found a way of coming at it without him; and, what is still more extraordinary, he found himself under a necessity of relating a matter of fact in his history, from which it could not be, but the doctrine might be inferred, though Moses did all he could to wrap it up in the utmost obscurity.

But why should Moses endeavour to conceal this doctrine of the separate existence? Because, being preparatory to another doctrine, which it was necessary at all events his people should not learn, he was afraid that the Jews would certainly build this other consequential doctrine upon the preparatory one; an accident that would have defeated the end of his system.

Here again the great legislator was mistaken in his men, and was afraid where no fear was. For the Jews, being got into possession of the preparatory doctrine, whether Moses would or no, made no manner of use of it at all; but contented themselves with holding it as an

insipid truth of no consequence, without forming the least interesting speculation upon it imaginable.

Upon the whole, consider the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul as a doctrine espoused by the early Jews, upon Dr. W's principles, in what light you will, and you meet with insuperable difficulties, and embarrassments on every hand.

If you suppose the early Jews to have had this doctrine from the rest of mankind by way of tradition; or if you suppose them to have come by it, as the rest of mankind did, in the way of reason and inference from the nature of the thing; it will be impossible for you to assign a reason why they did not go on with the rest of mankind to the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment; which will not likewise be a reason why they would not go even so far with them as the preparatory principle itself. For,

1. If you alledge the prohibition in the law of Moses, forbidding them to add any thing to the written institute, which, we will allow, makes no mention of future rewards and punishments; you lay yourself under a necessity of shewing, what never can be shewn, that the written institute does make some mention of the separate existence of the soul.

2. If you appeal to the nature of the Mosaic sanction of temporal rewards and punishments, you will find in these no considerations which would prevent the Jews from expecting future rewards and punishments, and would not at the same time cut off all their hopes of future existence.

This perhaps will not a little surprise you. You will be very sensible that the veil was not always to remain upon the hearts of these Jews, with respect to this doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment. It was gradually to be taken away. And the first step seems naturally to be to teach them the preparatory doctrine of the separate existence of the soul.

But when you come to particulars, you will soon find the notion that this doctrine is preparatory to that of a future state, to be no better than a mere delusion.

For what rational doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment can you build upon the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul? None at all: none at least which hath hitherto appeared in the *Divine Legation*, or its appendages.

Not Dr W's general doctrine that God is just, &c. for that stands good without any consideration had of any particular mode of future existence, and is, indeed, in some men's account, the basis of the separate existence itself.

Not the free and candid *Examiner's* doctrine of a short and transient future state;* for with that, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is utterly inconsistent.

* "The beſt of men by the light of reaſon, can expect only "ſome ſlight and inconſiderable reward of a ſhort and tranſient "duration; as this might be a ſufficient compenſation for all their "ſervices and ſufferings in the preſent life." *Exam.* p. 69. This future ſtate of reward it will be impoſſible to realize upon the principle of the natural immortality of the ſoul. If you limit the duration of the reward, you muſt either, at the ſame time, limit the ſoul's capacity for enjoying it, and ſo deſtroy thoſe active and percep-

Not the christian doctrine of a future state consisting in the restoration to a lost inheritance. For the doctrine of the immortality or

tive powers essential to it, and from which the natural immortality itself is inferred: or if you limit the duration of the reward, and leave the soul its capacity for enjoying it, you turn the state of reward into a state of punishment; that is, into a state of desire, without a possibility of fruition. Indeed I take some pleasure in flattering myself that this ingenious writer has no better opinion of this preparatory doctrine than I have; and that he thinks the doctrine of the separate existence, preparatory to nothing, unless perhaps to the poetical fables of Elysium and Tartarus, or, "the rabbinical notion "of another life, picked up by the Jews from among their pagan "neighbours, and evidently founded on the *pythagoric metempsychosis*." If I understand him right, he means to say,(*Examination* p. 71,) that, "supposing a future immortality might be deduced from the moral attributes of God, the death and sacrifice of "Christ would have been unnecessary, unless we can suppose they were "appointed for an end, which had no dependence upon them, and "must naturally have followed, though they had never been." This consideration, I apprehend, excludes the use of the natural immortality as a preparatory doctrine to any system of a future state deducible from the moral attributes of God by natural reason, and indeed, contradicts the very notion of it. On the other hand he tells us (p. 341.) that "Dr. Law, by asserting the sleep of the soul be-"tween death and the resurrection, disables himself from proving "that a future state was sufficiently revealed, either in the patriar-"chal or jewish religions. For who, says he, would pretend to "discover the doctrine of the resurrection in any of the books of "Moses?" By which this learned writer seems to admit, that wherever the doctrine of a resurrection may be discovered or is brought to light, there a future state is sufficiently revealed, whether the soul sleeps (or ceases to exist) between death and the resurrection or no. The consequence of which is, that the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul cannot be preparatory, or fundamental to the christian doctrine of a future state. If indeed the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, is a scripture doctrine, Dr. Law is so far mistaken in his hypothesis. But even then, it cannot be intituled to the name of a preparatory doctrine of the christian future state, unless it is so taught, that the doctrine of the resurrection must necessarily be either mediately or immediately built upon it. Concerning which more by and by.

separate existence of the soul supposes the inheritance not to be lost, and consequently the restoration to it to be an absurdity in terms.

But this does not still satisfy. For you are told, that the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul may be found in a certain book of the old testament, among the sentiments of the early Jews; and that there is a passage even in the writings of Moses himself, from which it could not be but that a separate state might be inferred.

You go to the book in the first place, which is said to exhibit the doctrine in plain terms; and there you find the texts referred to, instead of supporting the affirmative, strongly and plainly implying the negative, and setting forth nothing, but the complaints of a man void of every hope of a future life, and looking for nothing after death to distinguish him from the beasts that perish.

If, on the other hand, you should suffer yourself to be persuaded that these texts speak to the purpose intended, you have the mortification to be told, upon farther inquiry, that the book wherein they are found, instead of speaking the sentiments of the early Jews, speaks only the contradictory speculations of a man personating several different characters, and whose sentiments, if so they may be called, are those of a pagan sage, and some of them of a downright epicurean, intermixed with a few others, which perhaps might not have misbecome a more enlightened Jew.

You inquire finally what traces of a separate existence may be met with in the writings of Moses? And here you are sent to a passage penned

with so studied an obscurity, that no mortal in those days would know what to make of it; which has even puzzled some of the learned in these latter ages; but which is most commonly supposed by christian writers to mention the translation of a certain person from earth to heaven, without seeing death. And in this passage, you may if you please believe, there was not a Jew among them but might have seen the separate existence of the soul, as clear as the sun at noon day.

The free and candid *Examiner*, hath been pleased to direct us to a certain "great and "illustrious writer, as the only person in the "world, from whom we are to expect a full "and final solution of the several difficulties "relating to the question, concerning the "difference between the natural and revealed "doctrines of a future state."*

How far this great and illustrious writer may think himself obliged to answer these expectations, we cannot say; as the case stands at present, he seems to have created no small number of these difficulties himself; chiefly indeed, as it appears to us, by incumbering his system with this preparatory doctrine of a separate existence of the soul

To point out one or two instances. Dr. W. says, that the immortality or separate existence of the soul, may be inferred from the nature of the thing; in other words, is a conclusion of natural reason.† It is likewise, according to

* Examination, p. 69.

† "I think, says Dr. W. it may be strictly demonstrated that "man has an immaterial soul; but then the same arguments which

him, a conclusion of natural reason, that God is just, and will reward every man according to his works ; insomuch that if the distribution of good and evil be not made here, it will be hereafter ; but natural reason learns from experience and observation that this distribution is not made here, therefore hereafter.

Lay these doctrines together, and you have a future immortality with rewards and punishments, strictly deducible from the principles of natural religion.

But in the *Examiner's* account, this is to confound the difference between the natural and revealed doctrines of a future state. And Dr. W. must be contented, as far as we see, to take my lord bishop of London's place in the Examiner's inquisition, i. e. "Dr. W. will very "much ennoble the natural system, if he can "annex to it the promise of a future immor- "tality; but then he must at the same time "paganize the gospel institution, divest it of "the essential doctrine of redemption, and so "sink and degrade it into a mere republica- "tion of the religion of nature."* Again; the learned Dr. says, that a future state of re-

"prove that, prove likewise that the souls of all living animals are "immaterial; this too without the least injury to religion." D. L. p. 555. Hence arise these questions. 1. What system of religion it is that would be injured, supposing the immateriality of the soul could not be demonstrated at all? 2. Whether the ancient Jews inferred the separate existence of the soul through the medium of the immateriality? If not, then, 3. From what nature of what thing they did infer this doctrine? The great and illustrious writer, will we hope, be clear and explicit upon the several subjects of these questions; as in our apprehension, they nearly concern the difference between the natural and revealed doctrines of a future state.

* Examination, p. 72.

ward and punishment is built upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; * meaning that future state which Moses did not disbelieve; which, and no other, Moses must have taught if he would teach any; which stands immediately on its being a restoration to a lost inheritance, purchased by a redeemer:—in one word, the christian future state, of which the resurrection of Jesus is the pledge or earnest, and which, as to its truth or final verification, depends upon the general resurrection of the dead. *For if the dead rise not, then is not* Christ *risen, and if* Christ *be not risen, our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins,* [i. e. unredeemed] *then they also which are fallen asleep in* Christ *are perished.* †

Now if this doctrine of a future state, is built upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in a state of separate existence, the immortality of the soul must be previous in the order of teaching; that is to say, it must be established, before the doctrines of restoration, redemption, resurrection, &c. can be built upon it. But if a future immortality of the soul in a state of separate existence, might be established (no matter upon what principles) previous to the doctrine of redemption; the resurrection of the dead, as a means of restoration to life and immortality, "would have been "unnecessary, unless we can suppose it was "appointed for the attainment of an end which "had no dependence upon it, and which must "have followed, though the resurrection had "never been." ‡

* D. L. p. 483. † 1 Cor. xv. 16, 17, 18.

‡ Examin, p. 71.

If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as the fundamental doctrine of the christian future state, may be deduced from the principles of the christian religion, then the doctrines of redemption, restoration, resurrection, &c. are rendered unnecessary by the principles of christianity itself.

If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, considered as fundamental to the christian doctrine of a future state, is a conclusion of natural reason, Dr. W. and the Examiner, will find themselves equally obliged with the bishop of London, to prove, that "they think "wrong, who think the doctrine of St. Paul "[that life and immortality were brought to "light through the gospel] is exclusive of all "arguments for a future immortality drawn "from the light of nature and reason." For assuredly, neither the learned Dr. nor his friend will consent to have the basis of the christian future state laid by nature, where "nature finds no ground whereon to rest her "foot, in a wide waste, a land of doubt and "uncertainty."*

* Examin. p. 68—70. The Examiner ſays, that "the beſt of men "by the light of reaſon, can expect only ſome ſlight and inconſider-"able reward of a ſhort and tranſient duration, as this might be a "ſufficient compenſation for all their ſervices and ſufferings in the "preſent life." This expectation is founded on the principle, that God is juſt, and will reward every man according to his works, and this, according to the Examiner, is the amount of the natural doctrine of a future ſtate, taking in the ſuppoſition that good and evil are unequally diſtributed iu this life. But this doctrine, ſo far as it concerns a future ſtate, is only hypothetical, *if* the diſtribution is not made here. But *if* theſe ſlight, inconſiderable, ſhort and tranſient compenſations are made here, and if the beſt of men have as much of this compenſation as they can claim, in this life, this argument that God is juſt, &c. will prove no future ſtate at all. But natural rea-

Once more. "To prove, says the Examin-
"er, that there is any real repugnancy and
"contradiction between Dr. Warburton's in-
"terpretation of this text, (2 Tim. i. 10.) and
"the natural argument for a future state, his
"Lordship must shew that the natural and
"revealed doctrines of another life are one
"and the same." *Examination*, p. 70.

The Examiner speaks here as if there was but one natural argument for a future state. But if the immortality of the soul may be inferred from the nature of the thing, that must likewise be another natural argument for a future state; and accordingly the rest of mankind, as distinguished from the Jews, built a future state upon this principle. But the same principle is likewise the principle upon which, according to Dr. Warburton, the christian doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment is built.

If therefore my Lord of London will vouchsafe to accept of Dr. Warburton's safe conduct, he may go a much nearer way to establish the identity in question than the Examiner would lead him. For surely the difference between two doctrines on the same subject, which stand

ſon can never diſcover that any man has either more than he can claim, or leſs than he deſerves. It is therefore unfair to call this, the natural doctrine of a future ſtate, and to talk of a comparative difference between it and another doctrine where a real futurity is revealed. If this natural doctrine ſtated by Dr. W. and the Examiner, be really the doctrine of a future ſtate, then Moſes really taught a future ſtate. For Moſes ſays in ſo many words, *that the righteous ſhould be as the wicked, that be far from* God; *ſhall not the judge of all the earth do right?* and this being the ſtated principle, in what ſtate of things did not the diſtribution appear to be unequal to the eye of natural reaſon?

precisely on the same foundation, must be very inconsiderable.—If the doctrines are found to be really and essentially different, Dr. W. must be mistaken in assigning them both the same foundation; for his distinction of mediately and immediately will not answer his purpose here, as it is supposed to do in that case to which he applies it.*

When I first went through the second volume of the *Divine Legation*, and was got thus far on my way, the perplexity occasioned in Dr. W's system of this preparatory doctrine of the separate existence, appeared, to my first reflections, to be incurable.

I could by no means conceive how Dr. W. would propose to connect the doctrine of a separate existence of the soul, with the christian doctrine of a future state as a basis.

After some meditation, it occurred to me that possibly the Dr. might hold the doctrine of an intermediate state of reward and punishment between death and the resurrection, to be a christian doctrine. For though he had

* "The recovery of our loſt inheritance, ſays the *Examiner*, is "juſtly repreſented as the pure gift or gratuitous favour of God, ſince "it flows intirely from his pleaſure and good will, and is not to be "deduced from any of the divine attributes by the light of nature or "reaſon." page 69. But if this be the caſe, how does the future ſtate of revelation ſtand even mediately on this principle, that *God is juſt*, &c. Theſe gentlemen may make as much ado as they pleaſe about anſwering infidel objections, but while they allow that natural religion teaches any future ſtate, they will make as bad a figure in this province as thoſe they deride. As to the feats that have been done by preſuppoſing and admitting the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul in our conflicts with the deiſts, the reader may receive full ſatisfaction in one ſhort paragraph of the learned and candid Mr. Peckard's ſenſible *obſervations on the doctrine of an intermediate ſtate, &c. page* 28.

dropped no hint to that effect, yet neither had he said any thing against it. And to this doctrine of a future state, that of the separate existence may be said, with some propriety, to be preparatory.

It is true, there appeared to me some very discouraging difficulties in any attempt to adjust this doctrine of an intermediate state, to Paul's doctrine of the resurrection above cited. But for this, I was very willing to depend upon the learned Dr's superior talents for solution and reconciliation; and in that confidence, I once more took up the book and went on with him.

In this situation of mind, the reader will believe it was matter of no little disappointment and surprize to me, to find a passage in this very volume, importing, that the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul was so indispensibly preparatory to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, that our Saviour himself thought he had sufficiently proved the certainty of the resurrection, by barely proving the separate existence of the soul.

Here indeed I was obliged to stick; and as my objections to Dr. W's representation of this matter remain still unsatisfied by any efforts of my own ingenuity, it may not be improper to give the reader an account of them.

The passage in question, is that which contains Dr. W's explanation and paraphrase of our Saviour's reasoning with the Sadducees on the subject of a resurrection, * recorded by three of the Evangelists, namely *Matth.* xxii.

* D. I. p. 571.

23—33. *Mark* xii. 18—27. *Luke* xx. 27—38.

The case stated by the Sadducees, was that of a woman married to seven brethren successively, who all dying and leaving her childless, the question proposed to our Lord was, *whose wife shall she be of the seven, in the resurrection? For they all had her.* That is to say, they would all have an equal right to her at the resurrection.

Now this last remark plainly discovers, that these Sadducees went upon that notion of a resurrection, espoused and taught by the Pharisees, namely, a resurrection to a state of carnal felicity; for the enjoyment of which men were to have the same bodily capacities in a future state as in the present life. But if this was not to be the case, all the difficulty of settling these perplexing claims, which, upon the pharisaical plan, would be innumerable and endless, vanished at once.

Our Saviour therefore answers in the first place, *ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, neither the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage,* BUT ARE AS THE ANGELS OF GOD IN HEAVEN.

This was a direct answer to the case put by the Sadducees, and at once removed the objection to a resurrection, arising from the reason of the thing, with which the Sadducees intended to intangle our Lord, and so made way for the proof of the matter of fact which follows.

This part of our Saviour's answer, Dr. W hath thought proper to pass by without any notice at all. For which, whether it occurred

to the Dr. or not, an obvious reason may be given.

The popular notion concerning the separate soul is, that, as soon as it is released from its connection with the body, it puts on the angelic nature and form. And under this representation have all our orthodox divines spoken of departed souls, in their public discourses, and particularly in funeral sermons; which, if they deal faithfully with their audiences, must likewise exhibit their own idea of a separate soul. But if, as our Saviour's discourse plainly implies, the angelic nature and form is not put on till the resurrection, we shall not know what to make of this separate soul, or with what comparison to compare it.

The learned and acute *Examiner* tries to puzzle my lord of London with the following difficulty.

"Since his Lordship affirms that the common "people are not capable of understanding that "they can be either punished or rewarded in "a state of a separate existence, I would beg "leave to ask in what manner christian preach-"ers are to speak of the state between death "and the resurrection? It will be to no purpose "to talk of rewards and punishments to be "dispensed during this period, if the language "be utterly unintelligible."*

Why really so should I think so too. But if either this gentleman or his friend the Dr. will favour us with an account of the separate spirit, which is different from that of an angelic spirit above mentioned, and is at the same

* *Examination*, p. 307. note (*b*)

time intelligible to the common people, the difficulty will be got over at once. In the mean time while our teachers tell us that if we be good and virtuous here, we shall commence angels as soon as we depart this life, they run a manifest hazard of passing for impostors, if any of their hearers should be so uncomplaisant as to confront their doctrine with this of the Gospel.

We cannot therefore but be sorry that Dr. W. should slip so fair an opportunity of giving the *Examiner* satisfaction on so important a point, which might, we think, have been done without any great inconvenience or impropriety, by taking in this part of our Saviour's answer for its share in his paraphrase; to which likewise it seems to have been intituled on another account, which is, that the Jews themselves would be at a loss, to conceive, in what sort of state *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* were then living, if they neither were, nor were to be *as the angels of God*, till the *resurrection*.

So much for what Dr. W. hath omitted to say. Let us now consider what he has said.

" There is not says the Dr. throughout the " whole bible, a plain text (as this is) so strange- " ly mistaken and perverted. First the case " of Abraham, &c. is generally understood to " be used by our blessed Lord as a direct proof " of the resurrection of the dead body, in the " manner that St. Paul urges the case of Jesus " himself. *But now is* CHRIST *risen from the* " *dead, and become the first fruits of them that* " *slept;* than which nothing can be more ir- " rational and absurd; the bodies of Abra-

" ham and the patriarchs being yet in dust, " and reduced to their primitive earth."

This is news indeed, that Abraham and the patriarchs should not yet be risen from the dead! But it would be greater news still, if the Dr. would tell us the name of any man in his right wits, who ever said or thought otherwise.

He cites indeed Mr. le Clerc for one; with what juctice let the reader determine.

What le Clerc says is this. " Our Lord urges " these words (*Matth.* xxii. 31.) in such a " manner, that he supposes one need only un- " derstand the language in which the scripture " speaks, to acknowledge a resurrection;" which he afterwards thus explains, " One need " only read this reasoning of Jesus Christ, to " perceive that it is drawn from this expression, " to be the God of any one, which one could " not apply to God, if he, of whom, he is said " to be the God, were dead so as never to rise " again."

Here all that le Clerc can possibly be supposed to mean is, that to be destined to rise again is sufficient to denominate God, the God of any one, though the man himself is for the present in a state of death; and that according to our Saviour's argument when that title is applied to God with reference to any particular person, the certainty of that person's resurrection may be inferred from that title.

Does it appear from any or all this that le Clerc ever thought of " our Lord's using the " case of Abraham as a direct proof of the re- " surrection of the dead, in the manner St. " Paul urges the case of Jesus himself?" Does

not le Clerc put the whole force of our Saviour's reasoning upon Abraham's being destined to rise again? And can one say a tenderer thing of so gross a misrepresentation, than that Dr. W. did not perfectly understand the French he has cited from le Clerc.

Be that as it may; the more absurd and irrational that Dr. W's antagonists can be made to appear to the gentle reader, the readier will the said reader be to imbibe the Dr's reason and good sense of which here follows some more.

"What hath deceived men in this matter is "the introduction to the argument *but as* "*touching the resurrection of the dead*, which "they supposed an exordium to a direct proof."

The Dr. will give us leave to remind him that besides this in St. Matthew, there are in the new testament two other exordiums to the same argument. One of them runs thus. *Now* THAT THE DEAD ARE RAISED *even Moses* SHEWED *at the bush.* From which expression, if it does not usher in a direct proof of the resurrection of the dead, I am afraid it will follow that Luke was deceived as well as others. Mark's exordium likewise contributes to the deception. *And as touching the dead* THAT THEY RISE. So that, it should seem, they who are deceived by Matthew's introduction, are deceived in good company.

The Dr. proceeds. "Whereas the proof "that follows is only indirect, namely an ar-"gument for the separate existence of the "soul."

This is remarkable. As plain a text as any in the whole bible, exhibits only an indirect proof of a doctrine it is expressly brought to

establish, and a direct argument for a doctrine of which not the least mention is made either by the objectors or the answerer! If this be the case with plain texts, what shall we do with obscure ones?

"But directly to the purpose." To what purpose? To the purpose of proving the resurrection of the dead?—Well then, let us see how this proof turns out, by virtue of Dr. W's paraphrase, which is as follows.

"But as concerning the resurrection of the "dead, you (Sadducees) ground your denial "of it on this principle, that the soul dies "with the body."

"No such matter, reply the Sadducees; we "ground our denial of the resurrection on no- "thing but the silence of the scripture. 'Tis "true, we deny a separate existence too, not "as a principle upon which a resurrection of "the dead has any dependance, but because "neither the one doctrine nor the other is to be "found in the law of Moses."

What will Dr. W. say to this? can he connect the several members of the Sadducæan argument immediately thus, "no separate exis- "tence, therefore no resurrection?" Or can he find in the archives of the Sadducees, the intermediate propositions that are necessary to complete the argument in mood and figure?

Perhaps the Dr. will say, that he does not pretend the Sadducees argued conclusively; he only insists that in fact they did reason thus.

Very well. We are contented to take it so. Prove that this really was their way of arguing, and we are ready to admit that the supposed confutation is good against them.

And how then? Why then says the Drs. paraphrase, "You err, as much in not knowing "the scriptures, as in not rightly conceiving "of the power of God. For the words of "Moses himself, which you allow to be a good "authority, prove the soul dies not with the "body, but has a separate existence."

Here again, the reasoning runs wide of the point to be proved, which is, the separate existence of the soul. It should have gone on in this track, "Ye do err, not knowing the "scriptures, nor the nature of the human soul."

The resurrection of the dead is indeed held forth in the scriptures as a special act of the power of God; and therefore to bring the scriptures and the power of God as joint evidence for the resurrection, is pertinent and proper. But the separate existence of the soul, having its establishment in the nature of the thing, you cannot be admitted to prove *that*, which is supposed to be already settled in the course of nature, by appealing to the power of God out of the course of nature.

But let that pass. What are these words of Moses which prove the separate existence? Why thus it is. "Moses tells us that God "long after the death of Abraham, Isaac and "Jacob, called himself their God. But God "is not the God of the dead, but of the living. "*Therefore* the souls of these patriarchs are yet "existing in a separate state."

And why not, "*therefore* these patriarchs "are risen from the dead?" The separate existence of their souls is no more in the premises than the resurrection of their bodies. "O but "that would be irrational and absurd; for

"the bodies of Abraham and the patriarchs "are yet in dust, and reduced to their primi- "tive earth." So it seems. But by your leave, we know this from better evidence than yours, and why should we take your single word for the condition of their souls? We have the greater reason to decline Dr. W's testimony in this matter, in that we perceive he hath actually sunk the concluding clause of our Saviour's argument to make room for this consequence of his own. *God*, saith our Lord, *is not the God of the dead, but of the living*: FOR ALL LIVE UNTO HIM.*

Here the whole mystery is unfolded; even they who are not in the account of men, are alive unto God, FOR ALL LIVE UNTO HIM.† All mankind that ever did or ever shall exist in this world; they who are yet unborn, as well as they who are dead, live unto God.

* Luke xx. 38.

† Bengelius's remarkable note on this clause, is worth our notice. "Ζωσιν, *vivunt* anima: ATQUE ADEO *vivent*, anima et corpore. "Tempus totum animæ a corpore sejunctæ est veluti momentum "respectu conjunctionis primitus intentæ et æternum duraturæ: et "respectu Dei, cui FUTURA sunt MINIME REMOTA imo PRÆ- "SENTISSIMA. Rom. iv. 17." First he understands ζωσιν of a present life in a separate state, and then gives you a most substantial reason, backed with an express scripture why it should not be so understood. And indeed is so conscious that a future existence cannot be left out of our Saviour's meaning, that to save the honour of his theory, he is obliged to make the resurrection a necessary consequence of the separate existence of the soul. Mr. Wesley too, in his note upon this passage, after an explanation which makes the text utterly unintelligible, seems to propose the compromise of a continued existence by way of immediate transition, I suppose from a separate to a resurrection state. And yet in the very next sentence he speaks of the body as an ESSENTIAL *part* of MAN. It would be much the wiser way for those who cannot part with a separate existence, to pass by this tormenting clause, as Dr. W. has done.

As this interpretation bears so hard upon the doctrine of the separate existence, we cannot expect it will be admitted on the part of Dr. W. without some reluctance. On which account it may be proper to observe, that if we do not take those who are yet unborn, as well as those who are dead, into the number of those that *live unto God;* the consequence will be, upon Dr. W's own principles, that when God gave himself the title of the God of Abraham, &c. he was the God of those who did *not* live unto him.

As thus. "The Jews reasonably might, "and in fact did understand the title of God "of Abraham, &c. to mean the peculiar tute- "lar God of Abraham's family. But that fa- "mily is to be considered as composed of "Abraham and his posterity collectively;" that is, of Abraham and his whole posterity taken together. And this is the very consideration which Dr. W. brings to shew, that "the promise to Abraham of the land of Ca- "naan, was literally fulfilled, though Abraham "was never personally put in possession of it." Whence it undeniably follows, that when God called himself the God of Abraham, &c. he was as truly and really the God of his whole posterity as of Abraham himself. And the consequence of that again will be, either that the unborn posterity of Abraham were then, as much alive unto God as Abraham himself was, or that God was then the God of those who did not live unto him.

I am so far from dissenting from these principles of Dr. W. that I think it not at all im-

probable the Jews should interpret our Saviour's argument by them. And if they understood our Lord in this sense, well may we who are now so much better acquainted with his language, and have the comments of his apostles upon it, and who now know that we have a right to claim this privilege of *living unto God*, for all the adopted as well as the natural posterity of Abraham, even for *all the families of the earth.*

But then what becomes of the state of separate existence for the dead? Why nothing at all, unless you will provide another state of pre-existence for the unborn; which some indeed have thought to be one necessary consequence of the natural immortality of the soul.*

Let these systems then, which are patched up of no better *stuff than dreams are made of*, even the dreams of drunkards, † be dismissed to the fairy-land of scholastic moonshine, where they were born and bred, and where only they have a legal demand for their maintenance, now that they are grown useless and unable to assist in the accomplishment of the grand scheme of man's immortal happiness. And if any paraphrase is wanted of our Saviour's doctrine concerning our life unto God, behold with what consistency, perspicuity and comfort you have it in the words of his apostle Paul.

None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live

* Vid. *Origen.* Comment in Johan. vi. 45.

† See the learned and accurate Dr. Jortin's Differtations, page 212. I believe it would turn out upon examination, that what this amiable writer here fays of heathen mythology, is equally true of heathen philofophy.

*unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.**

We have now, as we presume, ousted Dr. W's fictitious conclusion of our Saviour's argument in due form, and restored that of our Lord himself to its rightful possession. In which however we pretend to little merit, as the Sadducees themselves would undoubtedly have done it to our hand, had the argument been addressed to them in the garb wherein the learned Dr. hath arrayed it.

"This, says the Dr. is the force of the argument."

"Why then, say the Sadducees, the argument has no force at all as touching the resurrection of the dead (the only point on which we wanted satisfaction) no not even indirectly. All this that you have said of our fathers may be true, and yet no resurrection. We even think a resurrection the more improbable upon the supposition of a separate state of being, because unnecessary. If our fathers are living, we are sure it must be in a state of happiness, where they are enjoying the favour and loving kindness of God, in consequence of his promise to be their God. What more have they to expect? or what more can they desire?"

Thus, we see, is our Saviour's argument for a resurrection of the dead rendered of none effect, by this vain tradition of a separate ex-

* Rom. xiv. 7, 8, 9.

istence of the soul. And yet says the learned Dr. of his own licentious paraphrase, "our "blessed Lord *thus divinely* argues!"—An instance of presumption upon which we leave the serious reader to make his own reflections.

How Dr. W. would connect the resurrection of the dead, with a state of separate existence for the soul, as a consequence, we do not, nor are likely to apprehend, without some farther information from himself.* What he says is only this, "that the principle of no separate

* Archbiſhop Tillotſon has been a little more open and unreſerved in his comment on this paſſage. "Firſt, ſays his grace, we "will conſider what our Saviour intended directly and immediately "to prove by this argument. And that was, that there is another "ſtate after this life wherein men ſhall be happy or miſerable, ac-"cording as they have lived in this world; and this not only ſuppoſes "the immortality of the ſoul, but for as much as the body is an eſſen-"tial part of man, doth by conſequence infer the reſurrection of the "body; becauſe otherwiſe the man would not be happy or miſerable "in another world." (Sermon at Dr. Gouge's funeral.) Or rather—becauſe otherwiſe the man would not exiſt at all; for that is the genuine conſequence to his grace's premiſes. His grace's concluſion however we are the more unwilling to remove from its place, as it exhibits a ſpecimen of the "manner in which a chriſtian preacher "of the firſt rank hath ſpoken to the people of the rewards and pu-"niſhments of that ſtate between death and the reſurrection;" which we humbly recommend to the Examiner's notice. In the mean time be it remarked, how piteouſly the good prelate is put to it to ſupport his aſſertion, that a future ſtate in general is the direct and immediate ſubject of our Lord's argument. Having delivered what occurred to his own imagination probably, without being over well ſatisfied with it he tries to avail himſelf of a criticiſm of Dr. Hammond, importing, "that the true meaning of αναστασις, is a future or another "ſtate at large, unleſs in ſuch texts where the context doth reſtrain "it to the raiſing again of the body, or where ſome word that de-"notes the body, as σωματος or σαρκος, is added to it." As if that was not the caſe in this very paſſage! What pity his grace ſhould not have been apprized of Dr. W's expedient concerning our Lord's exordium.

" state being once overthrown, the Sadducee " had nothing left to oppose to the writings of " the prophets, or the preaching of Jesus."

The writings of what prophets? The Sadducees stuck by Moses. Had an hundred prophets spoken of the resurrection of the dead, and Moses alone been silent, you were never the nearer the conviction of the Sadducees for proving the separate existence of the soul. The proof of a resurrection was still to be brought from the writings of Moses. And if not here, where was it to be found?

And then again for the pertinence of the conclusion. Jesus preached the resurrection of the dead. No, say the Sadducees, it is impossible for God to restore a dead man to his vital and rational functions again, because there is no separate existence of the soul. Would not the argument conclude with equal force and propriety against the creation of man at the first?

We conclude then, that our blessed Lord intended this argument for a direct proof of the resurrection of the dead, and nothing else; as indeed every circumstance of it plainly demonstrates. " That God can raise the dead is " evident from the extent of his power; that " he will do it appears from his calling him- " self, (as is recorded by Moses in the scrip- " tures) the God of Abraham, &c. For if " Abraham were not to rise again, then would " God be the God of the dead. But we know " that *all live unto him;* consequently they " who are dead unto men, are alive unto God, " as being destined to a future resurrection."

It is true, it will follow from this reasoning

that our blessed Lord no more believed the separate existence of the soul than the Sadducees themselves. But it will be time enough to care for that, when this separate existence is shewn to be a gospel-doctrine. In the mean time, it is some comfort that it is a doctrine for which the christian religion has no sort of occasion.

Dr. W. as we have seen, that he might not appear to be too much in the common road, hath conjured up a set of irrational and absurd interpreters of this passage, who, it seems, will have it to be a direct argument for a resurrection, of equal force with that of St. Paul. 1 Cor. xv. 20.

Who these may be I cannot imagine; for the common run of commentators almost to a man seem to hold, that the argument for a resurrection contained in this passage cannot be made good, without taking in the immortality or separate existence of the soul.* Most of them go upon Bengelius's plan which is much the same with that of Dr. W. — *Vivunt* animâ, atque adeo *vivent* animâ et corpore."†

* Our proteſtant commentators are very angry with Cardinal Perron and the Jeſuit Maldonat for ſaying, that our Saviour's argument is inſufficient to prove a reſurrection without the authority of the church. How have they mended the matter? Hardly by ſuperſeding the authority of the church, and ſubſtituting the equally precarious authority of a metaphyſical ſyſtem in the room of it.

† If you aſk Beauſobre and Lenfant, two of the moſt learned and judicious critics among them, how it appears that becauſe theſe patriarchs do live in a ſeparate ſtate, therefore they ſhall live by the way of a reſurrection; they anſwer, with a little variation from Grotius, "that the ſoul of Abraham, &c. not being Abraham, Iſaac, &c. "themſelves; it follows from thence, that God could not properly "be ſtiled their God, unleſs they were to riſe again from the dead." And does it not equally follow from thence, that it cannot properly be ſaid that Abraham, &c. do live in any ſtate?

The circumstance that misled them into this weak paralogism, seems to have been this.

Our Saviour says, that *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* Where the participle ζωντων, being in the present tense, it was imagined it must refer to some life of which the patriarchs were in present and actual possession. This could not be the life subsequent to the resurrection, for these patriarchs were yet in their graves. Therefore it must be life in a separate existence. But still the argument undeniably aimed at the proof of a resurrection. Therefore again, a resurrection is the certain consequence of a separate existence. And some of them seem the rather to be enamoured of this discovery, because, as Mr. Wesley in particular observes, "the whole "scheme of the Sadducæan doctrine, * is thus "overthrown." As if it was not sufficiently overthrown by a plain and direct proof of a resurrection from the dead!

And yet, to see the force of prejudice, they could easily dispense with all those irrational and absurd present tenses, ΓΑΜΟΥΣΙΝ, ΕΚΓΑΜΙΖΟΝΤΑΙ, ως αγγελοι ΕΙΣΙΝ, &c. in the same discourse, which are all of them applied to the condition of persons to be raised from the dead, and who

* Grotius says, that the spirit which the Sadducees denied, Acts xxiii. 8. was no other than the divine afflatus which inspired the prophets, and which the Pharisees confessed. His reasons may be seen in his note on Matth. xxii. 23, and are, I think, decisive. Whence it is probable, that the separate existence of the soul never came into the dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees concerning a future state; and consequently that our Lord's argument had no relation to that point.

were no more already risen than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*

Dr. W. indeed, seems to have had another inducement to turn this argument of our Saviour out of the direct road to a resurrection of the dead, as appears by what follows.

"The second mistake is, says he, that Jesus "by these words, insinuates that Moses culti- "vated the doctrine of a resurrection, or a fu- "ture state. But here again the objectors "seem to forget against whom the argument "is addressed, the Sadducees. Now these "not only held that Moses did not teach, but "that he did not believe that doctrine. This "was the error Jesus aimed at in his confuta- "tion, and only this."

The reader will be pleased to observe, that this second mistake is merely the consequence of the first. "Our Lord brings from Moses a

* Accordingly the two critics mentioned in the laſt note but one; have given to theſe preſent tenſes a future ſignification, and inſtead of "are as the angels of God," render it in their verſion, "ſhall be "as the angels, &c." They might with equal authority have ſaid, "God is the God of thoſe who ſhall be living." But learned men through an incurable frailty, are often ſo intent upon providing for a preſent exigence, as not to be aware of their future occaſions: which is remarkably the caſe of commentators on the ſcriptures above all others. Witneſs the excellent Grotius, who having employed a large quantity of profound erudition on Matth. xxii. 32. to ſhew the connection between the immortality of the ſoul and the reſurrection of the body (upon ſome principles by the way, not at all favourable to the ſyſtem of the D. L,) renders it every ſyllable uſeleſs and inſignificant to the point in queſtion, by a very ſhort but very ſenſible note on the clauſe in Luke, "*for all live unto God*," in theſe words. "Solutio objectionis tacitæ. *Atqui mortui tunc erant!* Sane, "ſed, VIVUNT QUOAD DEI POTENTIAM, quæ poteſt mortuos "vitæ meliori reddere. Ipſe enim vocat ea *quæ non ſunt, velut* "*quæ ſunt.*"

" direct proof of a resurrection or a future " state; therefore Moses must have cultivated, " or taught that doctrine of set purpose."

The Dr. confutes the premises, depending, I suppose, that so far as this text is concerned, the conclusion would drop of course. And so indeed it does; but then, untowardly enough, another conclusion will arise from the Dr's. confutation, which we apprehend he will hardly admit. For by substituting a separate existence in the premises, the insinuation that Moses cultivated, or purposely inculcated that doctrine at least, still remains to contravene another of the Dr's positions. In which case these simple-minded objectors will be left to conclude that our Lord confuted one error by establishing another.

And after all, we are still to seek how the Sadducees or any others, should ever learn that Moses believed the resurrection of the dead, from a passage of his writings, which only gives evidence of the separate existence of the soul. Till this appears, the objection drawn from this passage, that Moses cultivated the doctrine of a resurrection, remains unsatisfied for any thing the Dr. hath said to remove it.

In considering the Dr's great sollicitude to establish his paraphrase, and the slender grounds he has for being so positive that he is in the right, I have sometimes been tempted to imagine that, (admitting this reasoning of our Lord to be a direct argument for a resurrection) he thought it really would follow that Moses cultivated that doctrine.

Whereas, in my apprehension, it might very well be allowed to be a direct argument for a

resurrection to the Sadducees of our Saviour's time, without supposing the ancient Jews to draw any such consequence from this passage in Exodus; and that for a very substantial reason given by Dr. W. himself; namely, "that the ancient Jews both reasonably might, "and in fact did understand the title of God "of Abraham, &c. to mean the peculiar tu- "telar God of their family;" without at all reflecting upon the condition of those their ancestors at that time.

But then, whatever effect this circumstance would have with respect to a resurrection of the dead body, it would have just the same effect with respect to the separate existence of the soul, as indeed Dr. W. allows, where he says, "that though the ancient Jews inferred a se- "parate existence from the writings of Moses, "yet not from these words." A concession, by the way, which gives us some occasion to wonder that our Lord should not rather chuse to convince the Sadducees of a separate existence of the soul by referring to those words of Moses from which their ancestors did infer that doctrine, than to those words of Moses from which they did not infer it: especially as their ancestors, as we learn from Dr. W. were certainly right in drawing their inference as they did.

But perhaps the following document may afford us a reason why our Lord went so far out of his usual method of instruction on this particular occasion.

"Besides, says the Dr. these objectors do "not consider, that this has all the marks of a "new argument, unknown to the Pharisees, and

" indeed both the dignity of our Lord's cha-
" racter, and the impression he would make on
" his opposers seemed to require it. Accor-
" dingly we find them struck dumb; and *the*
" *multitude that heard this were astonished at*
" *his doctrine.* But would *either* have been
" so affected with an old argument, long hack-
" nied in the schools or synagogues of the
" Pharisees ?"

Either of whom ? Why either the multitude in general, or the Pharisees in particular.—Now

1. It could not appear to these objectors from St. Matthew's narrative (the only one the Dr. makes use of on this occasion) that the pharisees were at all affected with this new argument. According to this evangelist, no considerable number of the Pharisees were present at this conference of our Lord with the Sadducees. *When the* PHARISEES, *says St.* Matthew, *had* HEARD *that he had put the* Sadducees *to silence*, they were *gathered together.* That is, as appears by what follows, they came together in a body to the place where our Lord was. A plain proof they had *not* been *gathered together* at the same time and place with the Sadducees.

2. By comparing St. Mark's and St. Luke's accounts of this transaction, it appears that some retainers of the Pharisees, some one or more of the Scribes were indeed present, and heard our Saviour reasoning with the Sadducees. One of these, St. Mark represents as perceiving [εἰδὼς knowing] *that Jesus had answered them well.* St. Luke speaks of others of them who told Jesus himself that *he had well said.* Which circumstances, far from betokening any astonishment or extraordinary emotion,

plainly intimate, that these persons were well acquainted at least with the principles on which our Lord grounded his argument.

3. The astonishment ascribed by St. Matthew (not to the Pharisees, but) to the multitude, was so far from being a singular incident peculiar to this occasion, that we find it was the consequence of our Saviour's discoursing in the audience of the people on most occasions, perhaps on all.* Not to mention the improbable and unscriptural supposition, that the people must needs be well acquainted with every argument which had been long hacknied in the schools and synagogues of the Pharisees.†

I would by no means be understood to insinuate that our Lord's argument for a resurrection, as it was urged to the Sadducees was not new. All I mean by these observations is to shew Dr. W's futility in assigning these, as the peculiar marks of its newness. Without all doubt the argument was new. But what then? So were all our Saviour's arguments.‡ Will the novelty of the argument as distin-

* See Matth. vii. 28. xiii. 54. Mark i. 22. vi. 2. x. 24. 26. xi. 18. Luke ii. 42. iv. 22—32. John vii. 46.

† Compare Matth. xxiii. 13. Luke xi. 52. John vii. 49.

‡ The following remark of a learned man on the case of paying tribute, proposed to our Lord in the former part of this chapter, may serve to shew how little the novelty of our Lord's reasoning was peculiar to his argument for a resurrection. "*Ex stimabant* Pharisæi *se ita callide laqueos* Christo *tetendisse, ut quocunque se verteret, illos effugere non posset.—Quid autem* Christus *respondit? an pro libertate an pro subjectione? an justos libertatis et subjectiones limites distinxit? Neutrum feciſſe puto. Cum enim, ut* Lucas *testatur,* xx. 27. *ipsi* Pharisæi, *responsionem ejus mirati tacuerint, nullumque ejus verbum apud populum carpere potuerint; manifesto indicio est nihil eum de re quæ in quæstione versabatur dixisse.* Wetstein. in Matth. xxii.

guished by these marks, tend to shew that our Saviour directed it more immediately to the proof of a separate existence of the soul, than the resurrection of the dead? No; if you carry the reasoning of our Lord no farther than it concludes for the separate existence of the soul, I am afraid it will follow from Dr W's own concession above-mentioned, that the argument might not be new. For Dr. W. grants that "the early Jews did actually infer a separate existence of the soul from the writings of Moses." And if so, I should be glad to know what good reason can be given, why it would not be full as obvious to the early Jews to make the inference from these words, as from the story of Enoch's translation, or any other words in the Pentateuch.

Such are Dr. W's efforts to prove that the early Jews believed that the soul survived the body; wherein we are surprized to find he has been obliged to make use of the very same

15—21. Here indeed are all Dr. W's marks of a new argument unknown to the Pharisees, some of which we shall look for in the other case in vain. 1. The argument concludes for the payment of tribute, without so much as touching upon the merits of the question as it was hacknied among the Pharisees. 2. The Pharisees here were really affected with astonishment, and in fact struck dumb. *They* MARVELLED *at his answer and* HELD THEIR PEACE, and according to St Matthew, they *left him and went their way.* 3. This was a question debated among the multitude as well as the Pharisees, who would probably be as much surprized at the novelty of the decision as the Pharisees themselves, without being strangers to the subject in dispute. Well, but "both the dignity of our Lord's character and the impression he would make upon his opposers seemed to require that his argument for a resurrection should be new." A mere parade of empty words! As if these considerations did not equally seem to require that all our Lord's discourses should be new, whether they were immediately addressed to opposers or not.

topics to fix this doctrine upon them, that his adversaries have brought to prove that the same Jews believed a future state of reward and punishment; and as it appears, with no better success.

Do they, for example, suppose that the Jews must have believed a future state of retribution, just as the rest of mankind believed it? So supposeth Dr. W. with respect to the immortality of the soul. Do they insist that the Jews would infer the former doctrine from the nature of the thing, notwithstanding the silence of Moses, or his endeavours to conceal it? So insisteth Dr. W. in behalf of the latter. Do they bring certain texts of the old testament to prove this belief of a future state among the Jews, which prove nothing but that they misunderstood these texts, and consequently misapplied them? No less unfortunate is Dr. W. in the scripture testimonies he brings for the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul. Do they bring other texts, which are not barely impertinent to the point in question, but even militate against the cause they are brought to support? Even so hath it happened to the learned Dr. even while he was warning the world of this misadventure of his adversaries.

On another hand, in his interpretation of our Saviour's discourse with the Sadducees there are some things which look but too like management.

1. He raises up objectors who never existed, out of an hospital for idiots and lunatics.*

* There are some writers who, when the business is to set themselves off to the best advantage, will frame objections the most ab-

2. He quietly passes by the former part of our Lord's answer to the Sadducees; which being interpreted along with the rest of it, would have thrown more light upon the argument than was convenient for his paraphrase.

3. He takes advantage of the words in St. Matthew, *touching the resurrection of the dead*, as implying, that the subsequent reasoning touched the resurrection, only remotely or indirectly. Whereas, according to St. Luke, it touched it so as to shew that the dead are raised.

4. By confining himself to St. Matthew's narrative only, he commodiously gets rid of the last clause of our Saviour's argument as it is recorded by St. Luke; a clause which confounds the whole paraphrase, and shews that a separate existence of the soul, was a point never thought of on either side.

It gives me great pain to differ so much from so learned and considerable a writer as Dr. W. as much pain at least as it gave the *Examiner* to differ from some of the doctors whom he hath so candidly and politely chastised in his extraordinary performance; and very possibly I may have as good reasons for undergoing it. But truth goes the farthest.

surdly wild and extravagant, that they may have the honour of confuting what nobody holds. Press the same writers upon another occasion, with a plain rational argument which is brought to bear upon them with effect; why then,—No, not they,

They wage no war with Bedlam *and the* Mint.

The luckiest thought for some of us, that ever entered into Mr. Pope's head; for it must be owned there are some troublesome fellows among these *answerers by profession*, whom it is much easier to abuse than to confute. See the note p. 6.

One difference naturally begets another. Had not this writer affected invidiously, to drag some excellent persons, who are highly and justly distinguished by the esteem of the public, into a disagreeable altercation, in which they neither desired nor appeared to have any immediate concern, and all to grace the triumphs of a man in few respects perhaps (within the provinces of truth and soberness) superior to any of them; Dr. W. might still, for me have enjoyed his separate existence in perfect tranquillity, secure in the indolence of common perusers, and the implicit reverence of his obsequious admirers.

Into the particular merits of the difference between the *Examiner* and those he censures, I enter not. I make myself answerable for no man's opinions but my own. What I insist upon is, that the *Examiner* had no right to maltreat as he has done, on Dr. W's account, such of these writers as contented themselves with delivering their own sentiments, without any particular reference to the *Divine Legation*. And the principal view of these strictures is to suggest to this writer, that justice, prudence and propriety required that he should first have disengaged Dr. W's system from the embarrassment wherewith the Dr. himself had incumbered it, before he had fallen foul upon so many men of worth and learning, whose objection to it may very reasonably be supposed to arise from seeing one part of it so little consistent with another; and who have sufficiently shewn their tenderness and moderation towards Dr. W. by their not giving the public this reason for their dissent.

F I N I S.

A

REVIEW

OF SOME

PASSAGES

IN THE

LAST EDITION

OF THE

Divine Legation of

MOSES DEMONSTRATED.

By the Author of Remarks on Dr. Warburton's Account of the sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul, &c.

To which are added,

A Defence of the above-mentioned REMARKS againſt the objections of CALEB FLEMING. And a ſecond Poſtſcript occaſioned by the ſaidMr. Fleming's late Advertiſement, &c.

[FIRST PRINTED, MDCCLX.]

A

REVIEW

Of some passages in the Divine Legation, &c.

THE ingenious author of *the Divine Legation of* Moses *demonstrated*, having brought his *demonstration* to this conclusion, namely, *the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the* Mosaic *dispensation*, foresaw it might be demanded, what sentiments the early Jews (who were thus precluded, by the law of Moses, from the knowledge and expectation of future retribution) entertained of the human soul? And to this the learned author answered in the end of the fifth book of the D. L. that "the real sentiments of the early Jews "concerning the soul, were doubtless the "same with those of the rest of mankind, who "have thought upon the matter, that IT SURVIVED THE BODY; but having, from Moses's "silence and establishment of another sanction, no expectation of future rewards and "punishments, they simply concluded that "*it returned to him who gave it*: but as to in-

" teresting speculations concerning its state " of survivorship, it is plain they had not " any."

Thus the learned author imagined he had found the means to compromise the matter between the orthodox opinion of the separate existence of the soul, and the demands of his own hypothesis. But it happened in this case, as it has done in many others, that while he was ridding his hands of one difficulty, others arose out of the ruins of the first. It was accordingly questioned, what this simple return of the soul to him who gave it, might mean? What sort of speculations upon the surviving soul they could be, that were not interesting? And how the sentiments of the early Jews, who had no interesting speculations upon the state of the soul's survivorship, could be said to be the same with those of the rest of mankind who have thought upon the matter, and who have actually concluded for a future state of retribution from this very doctrine of the survivorship of the soul?

Orthodoxy is suspicious and vigilant; and there being so mysterious an air in these equivocal terms, it is no great marvel that some writers, who take the alarm upon every approach towards innovation, should suspect, as we are told they did, * that the author of the D. L. endeavoured, in this cloud of words, to invelope his own real sentiments; which were supposed to be that "the early Jews did not " believe that the soul remained at all after " the death of the body."

* Examination of the Lord Bishop of London's very elegant sermons, &c. p. 279.

This imputation, the ingenious advocate of the D. L. in the examination referred to in the margin, highly resents, and ascribes it to the profligacy of Dr. W's. adversaries; appealing to the express declaration of the doctor himself; who, as we have seen above, tells us the Jews really thought that the soul survived the body.

But the same gentleman having intimated his dissent from the late Mr. Whiston, and another writer of more deliberation, who had "supposed the antient Jews might conceive "the soul to be in a state of inactivity during "the interval between death and the resurrec-"tion;" * it was suggested to him, that if this was not the identical opinion concerning the soul, which the D. L. intended to ascribe to the early Jews, it was so very like it, that, with respect to the effects of each upon the system of the said D. L. it was worth no man's while to contend for the difference. †

It was observed that the text cited in the D. L. to prove these *no interesting speculations* of the ancient Jews, namely, Eccles. ix. 5. *The dead know not any thing*, &c. supposing it to be a Jewish speculation upon the soul, necessarily represents the sentiments of the said Jews to have been, that wheresoever and howsoever the soul survived the body, it remained in a state of inactivity and insensibility.

And then how would this agree with the author's farther supposition, that this same writer of Ecclesiastes concluded for the separ-

* Examination, p. 60.——† Remarks on Dr. W's. account of the sentiments of the early Jews, &c. p. 9. et seq.

ate existence of the soul from the nature of the thing? * They who draw conclusions from the nature of things, are presumed to consider things as they are in themselves, without intermixing with their speculations, the doctrines of revelation, tradition, &c. And if the preacher's speculations upon the nature of the soul, led him to conclude, that it existed after the death of the body in a state of insensibility, certain it is that the preacher (who is said to speak the sentiments of the Jews of those times) did not think of the survivorship of the soul, as the rest of mankind have thought of it.

Again; the author of the D. L. calls the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, the preparatory doctrine to that of future rewards and punishments.† To be consistent with himself, he must mean that doctrine of the separate existence which the Jews collected from their speculations on the nature of the soul: but these speculations being no way interesting with respect to futurity, could neither prepare them for one thing or other of that kind. A simple and insensible survivorship of the soul, restrained as the Jews were by the silence of the law, and the establishment of a temporal sanction, was all that, in the opinion of the author himself, they would gather from their speculations. And for what could this possibly prepare them, but an acquiesence in the common fate of sleeping in the dust with their fathers for ever?

In this perplexed state were the affairs of the

* Divine Legation, vol. II. edit. 2. p. 483.
† Ibid. p. 413.

D. L. when the ingenious author was meditating a new edition. The option before him was excessively disagreeable; but an active, conscious, and sensible soul, in a state of separate existence, was at no hand to be admitted as an article of the Jewish creed. That was manifestly indangering the whole foundation of his work. He chose therefore to abide, for the present at least, by these no interesting speculations; and, to explain himself upon this head, so as to leave the Jews no chance for any knowledge of a future state of rewards and punishments, whatever inconveniences might be brought upon himself and his friends from the other quarter, he adds, in this last edition, the following elucidation.

"Indeed how should they [the Jews] have "any [interesting speculations concerning the "soul's state of survivorship] when PERSO-"NALITY did not enter into the idea of this "survivorship, that being only annexed to the "rewards and punishments of a future state? "Hence it was, that those ancient philoso-"phers (almost all the theistical philosophers "of Greece) who considered the soul as a sub-"stance distinct from the body, and not a "mere quality of it (for they were not such "idiots as to conceive that thought could re-"sult from any combinations of matter and mo-"tion); those philosophers, I say, who consider-"ed the soul as a substance, and yet disbeliev-"ed a future state of rewards and punishments, "denied it all future personality, and held "the refusion of it into the נשמה כללית, or soul of the "world. And JUST SUCH INTERESTING SPE-"CULATIONS concerning it had the few phi-

" losophic Jews of the most early times. In-
" deed no wonder, that a matter which so lit-
" tle concerned them, namely, the future con-
" dition of the soul, sould only float idly on
" the mind, when we reflect that even the
" knowledge of the first cause of all things,
" while no part of the national worship was di-
" rected to him, was entertained by the Pagans
" (as may be seen from the sure records of an-
" tiquity) with the utmost indifference, nei-
" ther influencing their actions, nor regulating
" their notions."*

Let us now consider what satisfaction arises to the scruples above-mentioned from this explanation of the learned author's proposition.

I. When this author first undertook to give us the real sentiments of the Jews concerning the soul, he would naturally be understood, by the common sense of every competent reader, to mean the sentiments of that people in the aggregate. The foregoing considerations and evidences relating to the silence of Moses concerning future rewards and punishments, are manifestly applied by the learned writer to the principles and apprehensions of the whole body of the people. " The law did not give or pro-
" mise future life; and therefore they who
" were governed by the law, did not expect or
" believe it." And the reason given why it was necessary these expectations should be cut off, is, " that the prospect, and more especial-
" ly the assurance, of a future state of retribu-

* Divine Legation, last edition, vol. II. part 2. p. 188, 189.

" tion would have revolted this people, against " the Mosaic dispensation, under which it was " necessary they should continue for many ge- " nerations." When therefore an enquiry was set on foot, what were the real sentiments of this people concerning the soul? in consequence of what had been said before relating to a future state, we had a right to expect an account, how far, and whether at all, the omissions of the law concerning a future state of retribution were supplied by those sentiments (the current sentiments of the whole people) concerning the soul. Instead of that, we are here put off with the speculations of the few philosophic Jews of the most early times; that is to say, with the sentiments of not an hundred thousandth part of that people. And if these are all the Jews whose sentiments we are concerned to know upon the subject; the question is not only a little out of time for the present, but quite foreign and impertinent to the purpose of those who are supposed to require an answer to it.

II. When it was asserted that " the senti- " ments of these early Jews concerning the " soul, were the same with those of the rest of " mankind who have thought upon the matter, " that it survived the body," every one must have conceived the author to mean the same sentiments with those of the rest of mankind who have thought reasonably and rightly upon the matter; the rather as he had said in another place, that these Jews concluded for the separate existence of the soul from the nature of the thing. Will it be allowed then by those who conclude for the separate existence of the soul from the nature of the thing,

that that part of mankind thought reasonably and rightly upon the matter, who held a refusion into the τὸ ἓν, or into whose idea of the soul's survivorship personality did not enter? No, they will tell us that the doctrine of refusion, or the exclusion of personality from the idea of the soul's survivorship, destroys every natural as well as moral principle, from which the survivorship itself has been reasonably and rightly collected by the rest of mankind. I do not ask here what sort of a separate existence of the soul it might be, into the idea of which the personality does not enter, because the author may be supposed to have acknowledged and cured that mistake, by a subsequent alteration in this last edition, which shall be noted in its place; but, perhaps, I may be allowed to ask, who would have thought that all these mysteries of refusion and non-personality had lain hid under the simple conclusion *of the spirit's returning to him who gave it.*

III. "*Personality* did not enter into the "idea which these Jews formed of the survi- "vorship of the soul." What is the consequence? plainly, that the early Jews must have concluded, that the soul did not survive the body. For personality, or conscious perception, are essential to the soul in a state of separation from the body, in the ideas of all those who have either thought or spoken of its real survivorship.

We have heard, indeed, in the course of the controversy, to which the D. L. has given rise, of a curious distinction of Seneca, by which he marks the existence of the soul in a state of refusion. *Desinit*, says he, *non perit.*

This however was but an ingenious quibble, which would hardly occur to the most philosophic Jew, of the most early times considering the principles on which it was founded.

But admitting that the early Jews speculated thus on the soul, they must be aware that the same distinction would equally prove the survivorship of the body. Since their own scriptures would inform them, that nothing happened to the body by death, more or less than a resolution, or, if you please, a refusion of it, into its kindred element.* And to this state of the body, Seneca's distinction is just as applicable as to that of the refunded soul.

Upon these principles then, which are the principles ascribed by the D. L. to the early Jews, the separation of the soul and body, necessarily infers the death of both, or the death of neither.

What now becomes of the "profligacy" of those writers, who have "*squinted*" at the learned author, as if he had held that these early Jews did not believe the survivorship of the soul ?† What heresy is there in this, more than believing that the body doth not survive the soul ?

But perhaps, the ingenious examiner of the Bishop of London's sermons should not be pressed too far with these expostulations, as it was impossible for him to foresee that his client would leave him in the lurch, by affirming that "personality did not enter into the idea which the early Jews entertained of the surviving soul."

IV. "Just such interesting speculations con-

* Geneſis iii. 19. Eccles. xii. 7.——† Examination, p. 279.

" cerning it, (the soul) had the few philosophic " Jews of the most early times." That is to say, just such as those of almost all the theistical philosophers of Greece.

Now, when a reader of the D. L. recollects all the various subtilties and refinements in these speculations of the Grecian philosophers, as they are exhibited in vol. I. B. 3, to which the author refers him ; it will seem very improbable that the jewish philosopher should intermix with such speculations, any regard or attention to the writings of Moses, lest " the " bible should be perpetually disorienting the " philosopher."* And yet, we are told, that these speculations on the state of the souls survivorship became uninteresting, because of the silence of Moses concerning future retributions, and his establishment of another sanction. By this silence, and this establishment, the expectation, of future rewards and punishments would be, according to the learned author, totally precluded ; and, if so, what was there to lead to, or encourage any speculations on the survivorship of the soul in any circumstances?

If the early Jews entered into such speculations at all, the inducement could only be, that, whereas the law said neither one thing nor other concerning futurity, they might possibly find out a principle of future life another way ; namely, by speculating on the nature of the human soul. And here the plain presumption is, that the law, being barely silent concerning futurity, would be understood, either

* See Divine Legation, vol. II. part 2. p. 402.

not to interfere at all with their speculations on the nature and future existence of the soul, or so to interfere by the establishment of another sanction, as to prohibit their philosophizing or speculating on the subject at all. For the author, therefore, to say that the silence of Moses, and the temporal sanction of his law, would render the jewish speculations uninteresting, by excluding personality from the idea they formed of the survivorship of the soul, is neither better nor worse than begging premises whereon to erect an hypothesis, to which neither reason nor scripture will afford a foundation.

V. "Indeed, no wonder that a matter "which so little concerned them, namely, the "future existence of the soul, should float idly "on the mind."

That is to say, it was a matter of no concern or signification to these early Jews, whether the soul survived the body or not. Why all this clamor then against those profligates, who ascribe to this author an opinion of the very same importance? Be it remembered, however, that the paragraph set out with a pretence to give us the real sentiments of the Jews concerning the soul. The learned author accordingly attempts it, but delivers himself in obscure and equivocal terms, which leave his readers unsatisfied and uninformed. He is required to explain himself. And, after the solemn parade of a comment, just as mysterious as the text, it turns out at last, that these early Jews had no real sentiments concerning the survivorship of the soul at all. For whatever floats idly in the mind, if the expression has any

real meaning, must be something concerning which, the person in whose mind it floats, does not exercise the powers of thought and reflection; or, in other words, concerning which that person forms no real sentiments. It would hardly be safe for a writer of less eminence to banter his readers at this rate.

VI. But, it seems, it will be no wonder that the jewish speculations on the future existence of the soul should be so idle and uninteresting, "when we reflect that even the knowledge of "the first cause of all things, while no part of "the national worship was directed to him, "was entertained by the Pagans with the ut-"most indifference, neither influencing their "actions, nor regulating their notions."

This observation is calculated to shew, that neither the actions of these early Jews would be influenced, nor their notions regulated, by their speculations on the future existence of the soul; because those speculations received no support from their national religion, But the learned writer, to make this illustration of any use to his cause, should have first proved that the early Jews really had such speculations as he has ascribed to them. In the mean time the discerning reader will perceive, that the two cases of the Jews and Pagans are widely different. For,

1. The knowledge of the first cause of all things, such as it was among the Pagans, did not hinder them from concluding, that he could neither be angry nor hurt any one. And where is the wonder that this knowledge, thus qualified, should not either influence their actions, or regulate their notions; since the

deity, thus stripped of his moral government, must, with respect to all religious influence, be next to nothing? This we learn from so much of the sure records of antiquity, as the learned writer himself hath exhibited; which at the same time that they discover, do likewise account for, the slender influence this knowledge had on the manners and sentiments of the Pagans, by informing us of the particulars and extent of the knowledge itself.

But where are the sure records of antiquity, which prove that the early Jews had any knowledge or conception of the survivorship of the soul? The texts alledged from the book of Ecclesiastes, afford no satisfaction on this head. You may, if you please, argue from those texts, that the speculations of the Jews on the survivorship of the soul were not interesting; but by comparing them together, you will perceive the reason of this to be, that the Jews (or rather the Jew) whose speculations they contain, did not believe the survivorship of the soul in any circumstances.

One might, indeed, insist that this author himself hath utterly disqualified these texts from bearing any credible testimony to the real sentiments of the early Jews.* But as he now appears to have changed his mind a second time, we shall not press him with the judgment he once passed upon this book, which was probably drawn from him merely by the distress to which the late Dr. Sykes had reduced him. What we expect from him is only to prove, that Solomon intended, by the word *spirit*, to

* Remarks, p. 21.

convey the same metaphysical idea of a soul, which the learned author and others entertain at this day. Namely, the idea of "a thinking "immaterial substance distinct from, and in- "dependent of the body." For who knows, from the complexion of these texts, but Solomon may have been one of those idiots who have conceived the soul to be "a mere quality "of the body, and that thought might result "from the combination of matter and motion?" —But

2. The reason given why the knowledge of the first cause of all things, did neither influence the practice, nor regulate the notions, of the Pagans, is, "that no part of the national "worship was directed to him."

Were then the actions of these Pagans, who had this knowledge influenced, or their notions regulated, by the knowledge they had of those deities to whom the national worship was directed? The sure records of antiquity inform us they were not. And unless this had been the case, of what importance is the observation that these Pagans were not influenced by the knowledge of the first cause of all things? To what does all this amount, but to one among innumerable other instances of theirscepticism; who, saving the popular appearances of outwardly conforming to the established rites of their country, took the liberty to philosophize at their ease, without any concern to make their speculations consistent with the national system, and without confining either their practice or their notions to the regulation of any system at all.

Is this a parallel case with that of the Jews,

whose national worship, doctrines, and duties were prescribed by a circumstantial institute, of which God himself was the author, and to which they were forbidden, in express terms, and on severe penalties, to add any thing whatever? A religious establishment, with these circumstances, must not barely have interfered with the influence of a Jew's speculations; but must have been an effectual bar to all such speculations as did not immediately take their rise from the contents of their institute. A situation of which a Pagan philosopher would have no feeling nor conception.

For the author I presume will hardly say, that *national establishments*, as such, have the property of controling the *practical influence* of all truths which are not comprehended in their respective creeds. So I conjecture, upon recollecting some passages in another of his performances. And yet, without that supposition, what is all this elaborate illustration of the case of the Jews by that of the Pagans, but so much parade and amusement, which signifies neither one thing nor other to the purpose of giving any light into the real sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul?

VII. "The theistical philosophers of Greece "considered the soul as a substance distinct "from the body, and not a mere quality of it; "for they were not such IDIOTS as to con- "ceive that thought could result from any "combinations of matter and motion."

The provident author of the D. L. never employs a reproachful term idly. These philosophers were not *such idiots:* but he very

well knows who are; and secrets of that kind are sure not to sleep with him. Accordingly, in the progress of the work, we have the following censure.

"They who hold the soul to be only a quality, and yet talk of its sleep between death "and resurrection, use a jargon which confounds all languages as well as reason: for "such a sleep is an annihilation, and the waking again, a new creation."*

Here we have a glimpse of the idiots, and a sample of their jargon. But where shall we find either the idiots or the jargon out of the limits of the D. L? No person is named, nor any book referred to. No matter for that, the learned author had his meaning, and his reasons for giving us this hint. Let us venture at an explanation.

The author's ingenious champion (the Examiner of the bishop of London's sermons) thought proper to animadvert with some asperity upon a certain eminent writer, for reviving the old exploded hypothesis, or, (in the favourite language of the D. L.) the *semipagan* dream of the soul sleeping till the resurrection. For the rest, the Examiner dealt fairly and honestly. He named his man, and agreed that the question could only receive its decision from the scriptures. There he left the hypothesis, without its sustaining any other damage from him, than two or three contemptuous marks of his disapprobation.

But the author of the D. L. had his reasons for looking a little farther before him, and is

* Divine Legation, vol. IV. p. 346. edit. ult.

not, as I conjecture, so very forward to refer the determination of this point to the scriptures; inasmuch as almost every text he brings from the old testament to prove that the early Jews had not the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, serves equally to prove that they had no conception of the survivorship of the soul.

Aware of this, he turns these early Jews into philosophers and reasoners on the nature of the thing. But being at a loss for a system to set them up with, which should not interfere with his demonstration, he very gravely tells us, "that though they were led by the nature of "the thing to conclude for the survivorship "of the soul, yet had they no interesting spe-"culations on the state of its survivorship." A representation so repugnant to common sense, and so unlike to every thing in the history of mankind, that it is no wonder his readers of all complexions should be at a loss for his real meaning.

The plain truth is; the early Jews do not appear to have entered into any speculations, interesting or otherwise, on the survivorship of the soul. Their own scriptures afforded them no documents on the subject. And those arguments from the nature of the thing, by which, as we are told, the rest of mankind concluded for the survivorship of the soul, were the inventions of men of later ages, who had no light from revelation either to direct or restrain their inquiries into futurity. They have indeed been followed in these researches by men who might have had sufficient information from *the sure word of prophecy*, to render

all such idle speculations needless and vain. But discoveries made this way do no credit to human sagacity. And the pride of philosophy disdains to receive instruction at second hand. We find, however, to our great disappointment, that after all the cultivation which this kind of abstracted reasoning hath undergone for so many ages, the question concerning the survivorship or separate existence of the soul, is just as problematical as ever; nor hath it added any thing towards the determination of it, that the learned author of the D. L. hath declared himself for the affirmative.

So perhaps thought the learned and worthy master of Peter-house; or perhaps he did not think of that author or his opinions at all, when, in an appendix to the two last editions of his *Considerations on the theory of religion*, &c. he thought fit to deliver his sentiments in these terms.

" I shall only observe farther, that all phi-
" losophical arguments, drawn from our noti-
" ons of matter, and urged against the possi-
" bility of life, thought, and agency, being so
" connected with some portions of it, as to
" constitute a compound being or person, are
" merely grounded on our ignorance, * and

* An attempt hath been made in a late celebrated tale to discredit this suggestion, thus, "he who will determine against that which he " knows, because there may be something which he knows not,—is " not to be admitted among reasonable beings. All that we know of " matter is, that matter is inert, senseless, and lifeless; and if this " conviction cannot be opposed, but by referring us to something " that we know not, we have all the evidence that human intellect " can admit." Very likely; but suppose there should be some evidence necessary for the determination of this question, which human intellect cannot admit, how will what we do know supply the

" will prove equally against known fact and " daily observation in the production of vari- " ous animals (oviparous and vegetable ones " particularly) as well as against the union of " two such heterogeneous principles as those " of our own soul and body are supposed to " be.

" Try any of these arguments [*v. g.*] that " from extension, divisibility, or the *vis iner-*

abſence of what we neither do nor can know? That life and cogitation are moſt intimately connected with the material human frame is undeniable. We deſire to know how this connection is effected, and wherein it conſiſts? If this philoſopher cannot inform us, he muſt allow, for his own credit, that human intellect cannot admit the ſort of evidence neceſſary to account for this union. He nevertheleſs perſiſts in affirming, that the principles of life and cogitation are heterogencous to matter. The materialiſt perſiſts to aſſert in his turn, and upon equally good grounds, that life and ſenſe may reſult from certain modifications of matter. The philoſopher cannot confute him for want of evidence to eſtabliſh his own ſyſtem; and the materialiſts will tell him, that if the principles of life and cogitation are, as he is poſitive, heterogeneous to matter, they muſt be incapable of union. The matter of fact, or the union itſelf, is equally favourable to each hypotheſis. Why then can neither of them account for it? Plainly becauſe human intellect cannot admit the evidence neceſſary for the purpoſe; and their reſpective arguments are accordingly merely grounded on human ignorance. In the mean time the philoſopher roundly aſſerts, " that matter being created incapable of cogitation, " the Creator himſelf cannot confer cogitation upon it." So it ſeems had Mr. Baxter aſſerted before him. But as a learned writer juſtly obſerves, " there is no arguing with any one who is ſo inde- " cent as to aſſert it to be impoſſible for God to endue matter with " ſome certain powers, which, he thinks, do not belong to the mate- " rial ſyſtem." *See Mr. Peckard's obſervations on Mr. Fleming's ſurvey, &c.* And yet, what is ſurpriſing, this philoſopher can, in another caſe, make room by his conceſſions *ex poſt facto*, for the power of the Creator, where, by the courſe of his philoſophy, the power of the Creator is abſolutely excluded.——" Immateriality, " ſays he, ſeems to imply a natural power of perpetual duration, as a " conſequence of exemption from all cauſes of decay; whatever pe- " riſhes, is deſtroyed by the ſolution of its contexture, and ſeparation

" *tiæ*] and see whether such a parallel do not " strictly hold; whether these same qualities or " powers may not be, in such a manner uni- " ted, with the vital ones, as to influence each " other full as well as the different substances " or subjects of them; whether the very same " difficulties do not lie against a communica- " tion in each case; or whether the word sub- " stance helps any thing at all towards a solu- " tion of them. He that carefully attends to " the workings of nature, and sees how oft the " several classes of beings run into each other, " will not find very much weight in arguments " grounded upon ontological distinctions only. " And were there a thousand such, all tending " to establish an essential difference between " the two existences, at most they could only

" of its parts; nor can we conceive how that which hath no parts, " and therefore admits no solution, can be naturally corrupted or " impaired." And yet we are informed by the very same hand, that "the being which made this immaterial soul, can destroy it; " since, however unperishable in itself, it receives from a higher na- " ture its power of duration."—Can there be a nature higher than a nature unperishable in itself? But be it so. How comes this philosopher to be so positive and peremptory when speaking of the nature of matter, and so diffident and condescending about immateriality? " Because our ideas of immateriality are negative and therefore ob- " scure." And pray what are the terms, inert, senseless, and lifeless, which, according to him, are all that we know of matter, but negations of motion, sense, and life? And does he not see, upon the whole, that, by borrowing his conjuring terms, the materialist is just upon a level with him? E. g. " Matter seems to imply an " incapacity for cogitation: we cannot conceive how what is inert " and senseless should think; matter is naturally incapable of cogi- " tation: thus much may be collected from philosophy; but philo- " sophy can tell no more;—no doubt but that higher nature which " created matter can endue it with a power of thinking." And consequently any argument to the contrary is grounded merely on our ignorance. See *Rasselas*, vol. II. chap. xlvii.

" shew that the former of them might possibly
" be conceived to subsist apart from the latter,
" i. e. be sustained in a new manner, and with
" new perfections by the Deity; but whether
" he will actually so sustain it, can, I appre-
" hend, be known only from his word; which
" represents the thing, we see, in quite ano-
" ther light; nor indeed ever seems to coun-
" tenance these nice speculations, by treating
" man in any such intricate abstracted way.
" Let those who esteem it their great wisdom
" so to do, *go and learn what that meaneth*,
" which our blessed Saviour says, in answer
" to a subtile query of the same kind, *ye do*
" *err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power*
" *of* GOD."

Thus hath this judicious writer (than whom none more capable of entering successfully into disquisitions of this kind) exposed the precariousness of the received system concerning the soul of man: wherein he is so far from amusing his readers with his own conceptions concerning the principles from which thought results, or determining whether the soul is a substance or a quality, that, in grounding the philosophical arguments of those who think otherwise than he does, upon human ignorance, he fairly precludes himself from all pretensions of seeing farther into the subject one way, than the author of the D. L. and his theistical philosophers do another; resolving the whole matter into the power and good pleasure of the Creator. So that the sting sticking out of the tail of this negative compliment to the said theistical philosophers, inflicts no wound on the learned author of the considerations,

and serves only to shew the good-will of the party to whom the weapon belongs.

The provocation indeed, however undesigned, was extremely teazing. The word of GOD, to which the master of Peter-house appeals, comes to us by the channel of the Jews. And if this same word represents the matter in question in quite another light, nor ever seems to countenance these nice speculations, by treating MAN in any such intricate abstracted way, 'tis more than a thousand to one that the early Jews never had any speculations whatever concerning the survivorship of the soul. And the consequence of that again will be, that the learned author of the D. L. must go and learn among others who esteem it their great wisdom to figure in these nice speculations, the meaning of that saying, *ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, neither the power of* GOD. A word of advice, as we shall see by and by, not unworthy the notice of this learned author.*

* "It is probable (say the Critical Reviewers, August 1759, p. 99,) "the Jews were very well acquainted with the doctrine of the soul's "surviving after death, from its being a received opinion in Egypt, "and in several nations round them." What the author of the D. L. would say to this, I am a little curious to know. For if the Jews might probably learn the doctrine of the survivorship of the soul from the Egyptians, it is at least equally probable, that they might learn at the same time, and from the same teachers, the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, which is likewise said to have been a received doctrine in Egypt. But to induce the former of these probabilities, it should first be proved, that the Egyptians themselves were very well acquainted with the doctrine of the survivorship of the soul, at the time the early Jews are supposed to have learned it from them. A task, which they who wish well to these Gentlemen, and know any thing of the subject, will not advise them to undertake hastily. They go on. "But how far this doctrine

VIII. So much for the learned author of the D. L's first explanation. But as he had spoken of the sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul, in another passage at some distance

" may be contained in the old teſtament, is what perhaps will never " be determined, unacquainted, as we are at this period, with the " ſtrict meaning of the language in which it is written. The whole " diſpute muſt turn on the import of ſome Hebrew words; and who " is there now alive capable of being a judge in ſuch a controverſy." A mortifying conſideration indeed! as our ſlender acquaintance, at this period, with the Hebrew tongue, will equally effect every matter of fact, and every other doctrine contained in the ſaid old teſtament, as well as this particular doctrine in queſtion. But to quiet our apprehenſions for the preſent, be it remembered, that the Hebrew ſcriptures were tranſlated into another language, more generally underſtood at this period, two thouſand years ago. And, that they who tranſlated the Hebrew ſcriptures into the Greek tongue underſtood the Hebrew language, will hardly be diſputed by thoſe who believe that the writers of the new teſtament underſtood it, ſince theſe writers moſt commonly cite the old teſtament in the words of the Greek tranſlators. Perhaps indeed our acquaintance with the ſtrict meaning of the Greek, as well as the Hebrew language, at this period, might be called in queſtion, and not without ſome colour of reaſon. And, if ſo, how can theſe critics be ſure that the ſurvivorſhip of the ſoul was a received doctrine in Egypt? Concerning which we, at this period, can have no poſſible information, but either from the bible, or from the Greek hiſtorians and philoſophers. As to the import of particular Hebrew words, and of thoſe, among others, upon which the whole diſpute is here ſaid to turn, why may it not be ſufficiently fixed by the ſame rules of criticiſm to which we have recourſe in other dead languages? The principal of which is to examine the ſeveral contexts where ſuch words occur, and to aſcertain the meaning of them by the relation they bear to words in the ſame ſentence, whoſe meaning is leſs obſcure or ambiguous. If the words indeed, upon the import of which this whole diſpute is ſaid to turn, occurred but once or twice in the old teſtament, and in clauſes or periods conſiſting of the ſame expreſſions throughout, it might be difficult enough to come at the ſtrict meaning of them. But this is by no means the caſe. The words in queſtion are found in a great variety of contexts, and are exhibited in ſo many different views, that perhaps there are few words in the whole language, that afford us better grounds for fixing their preciſe meaning. The queſ-

from that which has just been under consideration, it is not surprising that some accommodation should be wanted to reconcile the one to the other; especially as, by withdrawing personality from the idea the early Jews formed of the surviving soul, matters were now put upon a very different footing.

tion, who is there now alive capable, &c. I would not chuſe to anſwer otherwiſe than by pointing the names of Hunt, Kennicot, Taylor, Lowth, and not leſs than an hundred more in our own country, (to ſay nothing of foreigners) which will live with the bleſſing of our poſterity upon them, when I fear the praiſe even of the Critical Reviewers, ſhall not have been able to preſerve the writings of an hundred others, from being the humble vehicles of pepper and tobacco. But it ſeems, this ſort of learning, ſo far as it relates to the preſent diſpute, is not very material. "We can know enough, and believe enough, without being "acquainted with a ſyllable of the matter." Which is juſt as true of nine tenths, at least, of the literature which daily iſſues from the Britiſh preſs, and in the courſe of every month comes under the examination of theſe and other cenſors, whoſe intereſt it can never be to ſtop up the channels of literary impertinence. Their motive however for impoſing ſilence in the preſent caſe is laudable.—"They could wiſh that our divines would therefore turn their arms "againſt the common enemy, and, while infidelity is at the gate, "not waſte the time in civil altercation." Meaning, I ſuppoſe, inteſtine altercation, which, as civil affairs are not the ſubject of the altercation, had been perhaps as proper an adjective. But to purſue their own figure. Suppoſe the ſubject of the altercation to be, whether the gate ſhall be opened to infidelity or not? Of this the Reviewers ſeem to have no conception; which is the more ſurprizing, as they themſelves have truly and juſtly obſerved on the oppoſite page, "that the eternity of the ſoul of man, *a parte poſt*, has "ſcarce the ſhadow of reaſon to ſupport it, and is obliged to fly to "revelation to ſilence inquiry." The Reviewers, however, as we have ſeen, preclude the old teſtament from giving any competent evidence in the diſquiſition, and conſequently refer us for the information we want to the new teſtament. And what ſays that? Why that to have eternal life we muſt come unto JESUS, for that *life and immortality were brought to light by his Goſpel.* Now againſt this doctrine both the Jew and the theiſtical philoſopher loudly remonſtrate; oppoſing to the goſpel, the one the law and the prophets of the old

How this reconciliation was attempted and what has been the success, will best appear by exhibiting in one column the passage as it stands in the D. L. edit. 1742, and the various readings in that of 1758 in another.

D. L. vol. III. p. 183. ed. 1742.	Various readings, 1758, vol. IV. p. 199.
" As to the * *separate existence* of the soul, we should distinguish between the mention of it by Moses, and by fol-	*Future existence.

teſtament; the other concluſions of abſtract reaſoning, and the light and dictates of natural religion; and the common conſequence of their reſpective principles is, that to have life and immortality, there is no occaſion to come unto Jeſus. From this ſtate of the caſe it appears, that all conceſſions made either to the Jews or the philoſophers on theſe heads, are derogatory to the authority of the Goſpel; and it is well known what advantages unbelievers of both theſe denominations have made of ſuch conceſſions. If then chriſtian divines are ſo imprudent as to give up points which it is impoſſible for our adverſaries of either ſort ever to prove, the defence of the fortreſs itſelf requires that they ſhould be oppoſed, as men, who (however unwittingly and undeſignedly) are ſtrengthening the hands of the enemy. Perhaps Mr. Hawkins (whoſe writings are the ſubject of this article in the Critical Review) may be one of theſe miſtaken brethren, who does not however appear to have taken his party as the ſafer ſide, or with any view to a vicarage. If he did, he certainly laid his account very ill; ſince the writer, who is at the head of the oppoſition, to the learned and venerable prelate whoſe cauſe Mr. Hawkins eſpouſes, hath obtained preferments worth a whole ſcore of moderate vicarages, and is now in a condition to command reſpect on other conſiderations beſides thoſe of his ſuperior erudition. 'Tis great pity that the authors of the Critical Review, who are ſo very capable of anſwering the reaſonable expectations of the public, by a juſt and candid account of new books, ſhould ever deſcend to theſe unbecoming reflections; unbecoming any, but the minuteſt critics of the loweſt claſs, to whoſe level it would be the greateſt injuſtice to degrade the compilers of the Critical Review in other reſpects.

lowing writers. They might and, as we have shewn, † *did draw this conclusion* from the nature of the thing. But Moses, who we suppose. intentionally omitted the mention ‡ *of a future state of reward and punishmemt*, we must needs suppose too would not proclaim the preparatory doctrine of the ‖*separate existence of the soul* ; nor could he on the other hand, deny what he knew to be the truth. Thus being neccssitated to speak of Enoch's translation, it could not be but that a separate existence might be inferred, how obscurely soever the story might be delivered."

† *did conclude for its existence.*

‡ *of future rewards and punishments.*

‖ *existence.*

The learned author of the D. L. appears to have framed the addition which now makes a part of the last paragraph of the fifth book, to get rid of an obvious difficulty, namely, the difficulty of conceiving how the Jews could entertain an opinion that the soul survived the body, without having any interesting speculations on its state of survivorship.

To account for this odd circumstance in the system of these early Jews, it is asserted that personality did not enter into their idea of this survivorship ; and to help our conceptions of the possibility of such a case, we are referred to the tenets of the theistical philosophers of Greece, and particularly to their doctrine of the refusion of the soul into the TO EN.

But while this learned writer was thus employed, it seems not to have occured to him, that he had affirmed elsewhere, that the Jews concluded for the separate existence of the soul, from the nature of the thing ; and that he had appealed to this very concluding paragraph of the fifth book for the proof of it.

Accordingly when this latter passage came to be revised in its turn, it was quite necessary to reduce it to a conformity with the additional account of the Jewish sentiments, exhibited in the foregoing book ; since a very moderate share of sagacity would suggest to any one, the impossibility of concluding for the separate existence of a thinking substance void of personality, and refunded into its kindred element, from the nature of any one or more things the world ever saw or heard of.

To accommodate matters therefore between the two passages, the ingenious author substitutes, in this last edition, the general term, future existence, or existence simply, instead of separate existence.

Taking the matter then, as it is now exhibited in both passages ; by the term future existence, must here be understood, that survivorship of the soul, into the idea of which personality did not enter ; for that, and that only, is the future existence for which, as the learned author hath shewn in this last edition of the D. L. the Jews concluded from the nature of the thing.

How differently the rest of mankind have thought upon the matter, hath been observed, and need not be repeated. It remains only to

consider, the effect these alterations will have upon some parts of this paragraph, which stand as they did in the former editions.

1. The learned writer had called the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, the preparatory doctrine to that of future rewards and punishments; and upon the supposition that, by separate existence, he meant a state of conscious existence, it was allowed to be preparatory to any such doctrine of future rewards and punishments, as did not pre-suppose a resurrection of the dead. It was indeed, and is still denied, that the doctrine of the separate existence is, or ever was preparatory to the christian doctrine, of future rewards and punishments, because the latter is built solely and intirely on the doctrine, of the resurrection of the dead.*

But now, as the matter is contrived by this late accommodation of the terms, it turns out, that the idea of the soul's survivorship entertained by the Jews, could not possibly be preparatory to any doctrine of future retribution. For as the Jews are no longer supposed to have admitted personality into their idea of the future existence of the soul, they cannot be supposed to have had any idea of the surviving soul at all, as a capable object of reward and punishment.

The D. L. itself tells us, that "personality "is only annexed to the rewards and punish- "ments of a future state." Consequently, and conversely, the rewards and punishments of a future state are only annexed to personality.

* Remarks, p. 30.

The author of the D. L. hath farther informed us, that "the theistical philosophers "of Greece *could not* believe the doctrine of "future rewards and punishments, because "they denied the soul all future personality." And, therefore, after the same author hath told us, "that the few philosophic Jews of the most "early times," (the same Jews who concluded for the future existence of the soul from the nature of the thing) "had just such interest-"ing speculations concerning the soul's state "of survivorship, as these theistical philoso-"phers of Greece;" can he expect we should believe him, when he would persuade us, that one doctrine is preparatory to another doctrine, which other doctrine, the doctrine asserted to be preparatory to it, renders utterly incredible and impossible?

2. It follows from these late emendations, that the future existence which "Moses knew "to be the truth," was that future existence into the idea of which personality did not enter. The doctrine of the existence which "Moses knew to be the truth, and could not "deny, but would not proclaim," is evidently the same doctrine of the future existence of the soul, which the author tells us he had shewn, the jewish writers posterior to Moses, inferred from the nature of the thing. Looking back to the D. L. Book V. Sect. 6. (the only place where the author hath attempted to shew this) we find that personality did not enter into that idea which the early Jews formed of the survivorship of the soul; and, consequently, not into that idea of the soul's

existence which Moses knew to be the truth. And yet this is that Moses, who, if he had taught any doctrine of a future state, must have taught the christian doctrine of it! *

It was formerly demanded, why Moses would not proclaim the doctrine of the future existence of the soul? We are now able to give ourselves an answer. The future existence of the soul, void of personality, might indeed have been proclaimed by sound of trumpet, at the head of every tribe of Israel, without admitting the most remote inference to countenance future rewards and punishments, as hath been shewn on the principles of the D. L. itself. But to what purpose? Undoubtedly this idea of the future existence of the soul, floated as idly on Moses's mind, as upon the mind of any other Hebrew, and concerned him as little as any of them; and, in such circumstances, it had been marvellous if he had thought of proclaiming it.

3. But it is said, "we should distinguish "between the mention made of the future ex- "istence of the soul, by Moses, and by the "following writers."

Does the learned author mean that Moses, and the following writers had different ideas of the future existence of the soul; or that they made mention respectively of different modes of the soul's future existence? By no means. It would be strange indeed to find the following writers, who, in all their rage of philosophizing, are represented to have paid a due veneration to their lawgiver, deviating in

* Divine Legation, 1742, p. 476.

their doctrine of a future existence from any thing Moses had mentioned.

It is therefore recommended to us only to distinguish between the mention made of the future existence of the soul by Moses, and by the following writers, allowing us still to suppose that Moses and the following writers mentioned, though in a different way, and under different circumstances, the same mode of the soul's future existence.

In the former edition indeed there is some colour for this uniformity of the ideas and sentiments of Moses, and of the following writers concerning the soul's future existence; inasmuch as the term, separate existence, which is made use of to denote both what Moses, and what the following writers mentioned, might, for any thing the readers of the D. L. *then* knew to the contrary, imply a conscious existence.

And yet, even *then*, it was justly remarked, that whatever the following writers might infer from the nature of the thing, a separate existence of the soul could not possibly be inferred from the translation of Enoch, since, in that translation, there was no separation of the soul from the body.

But now, the alteration of the terms, in the last edition, has rendered the reconciliation of Moses and the following writers, as touching the mode of the soul's future existence, absolutely desperate. For as it is not to be supposed that any Jew should be such an idiot as to conceive, that Enoch was by his translation divested of personality: so his soul and body

remaining still in a state of union, here was not the least hint in this case to countenance the doctrine of refusion, or any thing to support the following writers in the conclusion they are said to have drawn from the nature of the thing.

The indignant author speaks with great emotion of somebody who uses *a jargon which confounds all languages as well as reason.* Instead of returning the compliment, for which a fair occasion is here offered upon the principles of retaliation, let us see what it is that creates all this confusion of terms and ideas in this remarkable paragraph.

When this learned writer sets out with his distinction, you are to understand, that the whole of it relates to one and the same mode of the soul's future existence; only mentioned by Moses, and by the following writers, under different circumstances; and these circumstances are what you are desired to distinguish. But as you proceed with him in his explication, you perceive you are to distinguish between the future existence of the soul void of personality, and the separate existence of one knows not well what; if of any thing, of the compound man. A distinction which assigns to Moses, and to the following writers respectively, two contrary and irreconcileable doctrines on the subject of future existence. And yet this is the only pertinent distinction the case will admit of. For as to the mention, it now appears, that as the following writers made no mention of one of these modes of future existence, so neither was the other men-

tioned by Moses, or implied in any thing he did mention.

Why the learned writer substituted the term future existence in this last edition of his book, instead of separate existence, appears from this consideration; that a separate existence of the soul, into the idea of which personality did not enter; or a separate existence of the soul in a state of refusion, would have been a jargon, for which even the theistical philosophers of Greece, remote as they were from idiotism, could have made no room in their systems; which, however, abounded sufficiently in jargon of other kinds.

Why then, will you say, did not this author make the passage uniform, and tell us that a future existence was the thing which could not but be inferred from the story of Enoch; which, besides having the appearance of more consistency, would have been common sense at least?

Willingly would I satisfy you if I could; but, in the present situation of affairs, one can only guess. The story of Enoch, as has been observed elsewhere, * is not so very obscurely told, but that if you once allow it "impossible but that a future existence in "general might be inferred from it," I am afraid there are circumstances in it which will oblige you to allow farther, that a future state of *reward* might as aptly be inferred from that future existence; an inference to which the term separate existence, when this very ingenious disputant comes to tell us hereafter what

* Remarks, p. 37.

he will please to mean by it, may not be quite so liable.

This, however, is but conjecture. What we know for certain is, that, in the former editions of the D. L. the term separate existence was used and applied in the popular sense; that is to say, for the conscious existence of the soul in a state of disunion from the body. This appears from the author's calling the separate existence of the soul, the preparatory doctrine to that of future rewards and punishments; from his supposing that Moses knew it to be preparatory, and that what the Jews concluded in favour of a separate existence from the nature of the thing, was the truth; from his supposing the Jews to have held the survivorship of the soul, as the rest of mankind have done who have thought upon the matter; and, above all, from the confirmation he supposes the doctrine of the separate existence would receive from the story of Enoch.

What the separate existence to be inferred from the translation of Enoch, stands for, in this last edition, I believe would puzzle the most dexterous expositor of the D. L. to determine.

A Review of the additions, corrections, and alterations in the explanation and paraphrase of Matth. xxii. 29—32. D. L. vol. II. part 2. page 343, &c. *of the last edition.*

I

"THE case of Abraham, &c. (says the "learned author of the D. L. in the former "edition) is generally understood to be used "by our blessed Lord, as a direct proof of the "resurrection of the dead, in the manner that "St. Paul urges the case of JESUS himself, "*but now is* CHRIST *risen from the dead*, &c. "1 Cor. xv. 20."

To this it was answered:

1. That Mr. Le Clerc, the only person cited by this author, as so strangely mistaking this plain text, had in fact not understood it in the manner imputed to him; and, to prove this, the citation, brought to convict him, was appealed to.*

2. That this passage was not generally so understood; but that the generality of commentators had, with some variety indeed, gone into the beaten track which this writer himself pursues. And of this instances were given from Tillotson, Beausobre, L'Enfant, Bengelius, down as low as John Wesley. †

The learned author, perceiving, it is likely, that he had really misunderstood Le Clerc, and probably having no other commentator at hand to verify his general accusation, has

* Remarks on Dr. W's account, &c. p. 52, 53.
† Ibid. p. 60, 62, 63, 64.

thought proper, in this last edition, to vary the terms of the charge itself, as follows.

"The appellation of the GOD of Abraham, "&c. is generally understood to be quoted by "our blessed Lord, as a direct proof of the re- "surrection of the dead body, in the same "manner that St. Paul urges the case of "JESUS, *but now is Christ risen*, &c."

That Le Clerc indeed (who is still the only criminal in the margin) lays a considerable stress upon the appellation of the GOD of *Abraham*, towards the proof of a resurrection of the dead, is undeniable; but neither will this concession bring him within the reach of the learned critic's animadversion. For had he understood this appellation as a direct proof of the resurrection of the dead body, in the same manner that St. Paul urges the case of Jesus, he would have insisted (as St. Paul has done with respect to that case) that Abraham and the patriarchs are risen from the dead. "Than which, as this author sagaciously ob- "serves, nothing can be more irrational and "absurd; the bodies of Abraham and the "patriarchs being yet in dust, and reduced to "their primitive earth."

Has then Mr. Le Clerc said or supposed that the bodies of Abraham and the patriarchs are *not* yet in dust? No, it is not pretended he has.

To have made Le Clerc full amends, it should have been said, "the appellation of the "GOD of *Abraham*, &c. was understood by "Mr. Le Clerc to be quoted by our blessed "Lord as a direct proof of the *future* resur- "rection of these patriarchs." This had been

the honest truth. But then the reader would have seen that Le Clerc "did not understand "our Lord to direct this proof of a resurrecti-"on, in the same manner that St. Paul urges "the case of Jesus himself."

What Mr. Le Clerc may have said in the context of the broken citations in the author's margin, I know not, having never met with that tract of his against Father Simon referred to in the D. L. But as Le Clerc has explained himself elsewhere upon the subject, at full length, it may not be improper to lay that learned critic's sense of this passage before the reader, as well to vindicate him from the imputation above-mentioned, as because there will be occasion to refer to it by and by.

Le Clerc then, having observed that the words, *Je suis le Dieu d'Abraham*, &c. convey no other idea in the French tongue, than of the God whom Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had worshipped, and that nothing can be concluded from thence with respect to another life, proceeds to remark, that, in the Hebrew, those words I am the God of, &c. frequently signify the God who had promised to favour those of whom he is called the God, or who worship him in an extraordinary manner. And for this he quotes Gen. xvii. 7, 8, laying a particular stress upon the expression, I WILL *be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.* And then upon the words, GOD *is not the* GOD *of the dead*, &c. he shews that these patriarchs did not receive these extraordinary favours in their life-time; and consequently, if they were dead *pour toujours*, for ever, God could not be called *their* GOD in the sense of the pro-

mise. He then concludes thus, "the reasoning then of Jesus Christ sufficiently proves "that GOD, in calling himself the GOD of "Abraham, &c. engaged himself to be the "benefactor of these patriarchs in another life, "of which he would put them in full possession "by raising them from the dead." *

This comment shews how wrongfully the author of it hath suffered in the hands of our learned critic; and perhaps after all, the comment may stand the test as well as the paraphrase.

This phantom of a mistaken interpretation, the author of the D. L. goes on to encounter thus.

"The bodies of Abraham and the patriarchs, "were yet in dust, and reduced to their primitive earth. So that, in this sense, the "reasoning is so far from proving that God "was *not* the God of the dead, that it proves "*he was.*"

That is to say, "in the sense wherein God "is understood to be the God of the dead "bodies only of Abraham, &c. the reasoning "of our Saviour will prove that God is the "God of the dead."

But whose sense is this? Nobody's, unless it be the sense of the author of the D. L. who seems indeed to understand our Saviour as if he had said GOD *is not the* GOD *of the dead body, but of the living soul.* But neither the sacred text, nor Le Clerc's exposition of it, are so subtile as to distinguish man into his component parts. Both the one and the other

* See Mr. Le Clerc's notes subjoined to his translation of the New Testament, on Matth. xxii. 29. &c.

speaks of Abraham, &c. as men or persons, whether dead or living. So that the sense attacked by this author, may be sent back to whom it may concern.

But what? Is not God the God of Abraham's dead body, reduced as it is to its primitive earth? And if this is a difficulty which embarasses the general interpretation this author speaks of, how does his paraphrase remove it? "GOD, says the paraphrase, is the GOD "of Abraham's living and separate soul." But is he therefore *not* the GOD of his dead body also? Which shews the propriety, and at the same time the necessity, of Le Clerc's emphatical sense of the words, *I am the God*, &c. as referring to future and extraordinary benefits. In the common course of his providence and his sovereignty, God is the God both of the dead and of the living.

"No, says the learned paraphrast, Jesus, in "using the words [*I am the God of Abraham*, "*&c.*] to signify the maker and Lord of all "things, rightly inferred, that the patriarchs "still continued to exist." He should have said, "that the souls of the patriarchs still "continued to exist in a separate state."

We shall presently meet with a medium without a conclusion. Here we have a conclusion without a medium. For what logical connection is there between these premises, GOD *is the maker and Lord of all things*, and this conclusion, *therefore the souls of the patriarchs continue to exist in a separate state?* No wonder an argument so deduced, should appear to be a new one.

On the other hand, the justest principles of reasoning allow us to argue, that inasmuch as God is the maker and Lord of all things, he is the God of the dead, as well as of the living. The very inference the learned author of the D. L. ascribes to the interpretation of Le Clerc as absurd and irrational.

The learned author hath appealed to the wise and excellent Hugo Grotius, as agreeing with him, that our Saviour refuted the Sadducees by an indirect argument. *Non verbis directis, sed ratiocinando.** But, I conceive it would have been much more to the purpose to have shewn, that Grotius and himself were both of one mind in the interpretation of our Lord's reasoning; or else to have refuted the interpretation espoused by Grotius. He hath done neither; and hath therefore left us at liberty to cite two passages from this judicious commentator, the one to shew his agreement

* *Non verbis directis*: that is, (as appears by what goes before) not by any expreſs and poſitive words alleged out of the law of Moſes, mentioning eternal life plainly and openly: *ſed ratiocinando*; by reaſoning upon a paſſage of the law which implies it. But does Grotius ſay that the reaſoning of our Lord is not direct? So the author of the D. L. appears to have underſtood him, by diſtinguiſhing theſe words in the italic character. Had Grotius (who very well knew that an argument was not the leſs direct for being conducted to its concluſion through a medium) ſaid, *non verbis directis, ſed* INDIRECTE *ratiocinando*, our author might have availed himſelf of Grotius's authority. As it is, there is room to doubt whether he underſtood the wiſe and excellent Hugo Grotius on this occaſion. The citation from Epiſcopius is clearly on the ſide of Le Clerc, and ſhews that Epiſcopius never dreamt of any thing to be inferred from the expreſſion, *I am the God of*, &c. but eternal life by the way of a reſurrection of the dead. They both indeed agree that eternal life is not to be found in the law. But to ſay that they had the ſame idea of our Saviour's argument with the author of the D. L. is greatly miſrepreſenting them both.

with Le Clerc's real interpretation; the other to refute the objection started by the learned writer against the pretended one.

Grotius having observed that the patriarchs had been strangers and pilgrims on earth, goes on to say, "God promised to be a bene-"factor to the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, "and Jacob, for the sake of these their fathers; "much more will he be a benefactor to the "fathers themselves. But the dead are not "capable of benefits, if they are always to "remain in a state of death. It follows, "therefore, that they will be restored to life, "that God may be emphatically and peculi-"arly their God."

"But, saith the author of the D. L. there is nothing that wants to be restored to life but the dead body: If therefore you thus refer the words, *I am the God, &c.* to the dead body only, the reasoning is so far from proving *that God was not the God of the dead,* that it proves he was; the bodies of Abraham and the patriarchs being yet in dust, and reduced to their primitive earth."

This cavil was foreseen, and accordingly obviated by our Lord himself, in those words, Luke xx. 38. *For all live unto him;* upon which Grotius has the following note. "This "is the solution of a tacit objection, (viz.) "But the patriarchs were then dead.—True, "but they live in respect of the power of God, "who can restore the dead to a better life. "*For it is he who calleth those things which are* "*not, as though they were.*"

If the learned objector had never met with this solution before, he may now learn from it,

that his objection is not new. If he had seen it, it was hardly ingenious to repeat the objection, without the least attempt to overthrow the solution.

The learned writer proceeds. "Abraham's "body continued lifeless at the very time "when God was called *his* God: whatever "was to be the future condition of *it*, that "could not influence the present appellation "of the God of Israel."

Once more, the question is not concerning the future condition of Abraham's body, but the future condition of Abraham's person. But since this writer will needs have it so, let us take it his own way.

The appellation in the text under examination, is that of *the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, and not *the God of Israel.* I put in this caution here, lest the author of the D. L. should think fit to mean something by *the God of Israel*, different from *the God of Abraham, &c.* otherwise it had been as easy to have closed the period with the appellation as it stands in Exodus, and in the three gospels. We are now inquiring into the meaning of a particular text, and no one can have a right to change the expressions in that text, for the sake of grafting his own inferences upon the alteration.

Taking the appellation then as it lies in the text, I conceive the foregoing reasoning to amount to this, namely, "that the present ap- "pellation of the *God of Abraham*, &c. could "have no respect to the future condition of "the bodies of these patriarchs; [because, I suppose, the appellation was present, and the

condition future;] "and God not being the "God of the dead, it could have no respect to "the present condition of those bodies, be- "cause they were lifeless at the very time "when God was called the God of Abraham, "&c."

But the present appellation must however have respect to, or, in the author's phrase, be influenced by, something. And should we ask, what that might be? He would answer (as appears by the sequel) "the present condi- "tion of their souls."

Now the case standing thus, I am afraid we must conclude from this reasoning, that no future improvement of the present condition of these patriarchs (to let alone their bodies) could influence the present appellation of the God of Abraham, &c.

And yet, express and positive is the testimony of the sacred writer to the Hebrews that the present appellation of the God of Abraham, &c. had respect to, and actually was influenced by, the future condition of these patriarchs, in these remarkable words.

But now they [the patriarchs] *desire a better country, that is an heavenly;* * WHEREFORE

* Νυνι δε κρειττονος ορεγονται, that is, we now see by their calling themselves strangers and pilgrims, v. 13. that they then desired or longed for a better country. And herein I hope I shall have no controversy with the author of the D. L. who hath allowed that the patriarchs, and particularly Abraham, saw farther into the real object of the promises than the body of the Jewish people. A certain writer however, well versed in the style of the New Testament, hath, to the passage above cited, subjoined the following note. *Nullo indicio constat* Abrahamum *et* Petriarchas *de vitâ æternum in cœlis agendâ cogitasse; ergo sensus mysticus non est* Abrahami *sed* Pauli, *qui historiam* Abrahami *ejusq; errores comparavit cum vita et spe discipulorum* Christi, Wetstein *in loc.* I suspect this annotation will

God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God; FOR *he hath prepared for them a city.* Hebrews xi. 16.

That the patriarchs were not yet in possession of this prepared city, I suppose no one (except perhaps some such genius as Caleb Fleming) will deny. The condition enabling them to possess this better and heavenly country, was and is future, they are not to receive the promises or to be made perfect without, or before the whole body of the faithful.—But the preparation of this city (which, if Paul may be credited, includes the future condition of their bodies) is expressly given by this writer as a reason why *God is not ashamed of them to be called their God.* We conclude then, relying upon the word of an apostle, that the future condition even of the bodies of these patriarchs, both could and did influence the present appellation of the God of Abraham, &c.

Nor is this all. We conclude likewise, upon the same authority, that the present condition of the souls of these patriarchs, neither could nor did influence the present appellation of the God of Abraham, &c. Because, if the souls of these patriarchs were already in a state of conscious and happy existence, no reason can be given why God should be ashamed of them to be called their God, even though no city should be prepared for them.

neither pleaſe the author of the D. L. nor ſome of his opponents. But it is no worſe to be liked for that ſingle circumſtance; and may, after all, be as near the truth as any of them. I believe it would be very hard to prove that the myſtery of the chriſtian diſpenſation, ſo illuſtrioufly diſplayed in this ſublime epiſtle, was fully underſtood by any of the worthies of this chapter; not excepting Moſes himſelf.

In the application of this passage indeed I am only following Grotius; who, upon the words, *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living*, appeals to it as the key to our blessed Saviour's reasoning; which, without it, he observes, has the appearance of obscurity; and then, proving the unsettled and unrewarded condition of the patriarchs in the present life, from the apostle's account of them in this chapter, he deduces our Lord's argument, as has been seen, in the very same manner, and to the very same conclusion, that Le Clerc does.

Why then is poor Le Clerc loaded with the whole odium of this imaginary mistake, who was undoubtedly led into it by Grotius himself? And upon what grounds is it insinuated that Grotius had the very same idea of this argument with the author of the D. L? Might not this author as easily have gone to Grotius's Annotations, as to his Epistles? And what says the Epistle cited? Why, that our Lord refuted the Sadducees, not by direct or express words, but by reasoning. And what says Le Clerc's observation more or less than this? Did not the words, *ce raisonnement de Jesus Christ*, look this writer full in the face, as he was transcribing this citation from Le Clerc? and were not those words just as much to his purpose, as the words of Grotius, marked in italics?

And then again. Why would this candid writer go for Le Clerc's sense of this argument, to his defence of those licentious letters, which, as he elsewhere informs us, Le Clerc

wrote to pick a quarrel with Father Simon,* rather than to the sober and sedate comment subjoined by Le Clerc to his version of the New Testament? If this author did not mistake the meaning both of Grotius and Le Clerc, will not they who understand them be apt to say, that he hath neither dealt candidly with Le Clerc, nor fairly with his own readers?

"What hath led men into this mistake, says "the learned writer, is the introduction to the "argument, *but as touching the resurrection* "*of the dead*, which they supposed an exor- "dium to a direct proof."

It has been shewn, that the mistake is all on the other side, and it shall be shewn by and by, who and what it was, that occasioned it.

"Whereas it [the exordium] is an intima- "tion only to what an indirect one tended, "namely, that the resurrection of the body "might be inferred through the medium of "the separate existence of the soul, which "was the only point he proposed to prove "directly to them."

The expression in this passage hath not been very happily reformed. The author's meaning was much more explicit in the former edition. The first part of this quotation implies that our Lord's proof of the separate existence of the soul, was an indirect one, tending only to the proof of something else; which very possibly might be directly inferred from the said indirect proof. The latter part affirms, that the separate existence of the soul was the only

* Divine Legation, vol. II. part 2. p. 76.

point our Lord proposed to prove directly to the Sadducees.

But passing this by; it was certainly incumbent upon this author to shew how the resurrection of the body might be inferred through the medium of the separate existence of the soul. Common capacities cannot see the deductions in an indirect argument till they are pointed out. And for any information we have yet from the D. L. (beyond the author's own *ipse dixit*) concerning the relation between the medium and the conclusion, we may just as well trust ourselves once more to the exordium.

The learned author indeed says, that "the "principle of *no separate existence* being once "overthrown, the Sadducees had nothing to "oppose to the writings of the prophets, and "the preaching of Jesus."

Which will appear to be a very gross mistake if we only consider, that the objection the Sadducees brought from the case of the seven brethren, would have the same force against the resurrection of the dead, whether they had held a separate existence or not. Suppose our Saviour had begun with proving a separate existence; would this circumstance have precluded the objection they offered, or have furnished our Saviour with a shorter and more satisfactory answer than he made to it? What has either this objection of the Sadducees, or our Lord's answer to it, to do with a state of separate existence? We are then just as much at a loss as ever for a reason why the preaching of Jesus on the subject of the resur-

rection of the dead, would have no effect upon the Sadducees, without a previous proof of the separate existence of the soul.

Even in this author's own paraphrase, the separate existence of the soul is proved by a medium, through which the resurrection of the body might be inferred, just as immediately and directly as the said separate existence; viz. the power of God, and the testimony of the scriptures. If the Sadducees were satisfied with the proof of the separate existence of the soul through this medium, the learned paraphrast is intreated to say, why (Sadducees as they were) they should not be contented with a direct proof of the resurrection of the body through the same medium? Had they any thing to oppose to the power of God and the testimony of the scriptures in the one case more than the other. If not, what, in the name of logic, has the separate existence to do in the argument as a medium?

"But the case, it seems, stood thus. Our "Saviour was arguing against the Sadducees. "Now these supported their opinion of no re- "surrection of the body on a principle that "the soul had no separate existence, but fell "into nothing at the dissolution of the union."

As if the Sadducees had never supported their opinion of no resurrection of the body, upon any other principle! * or as if a persua-

* The very case the Sadducees put to our Saviour, is, as hath been noted, a demonstration of the contrary. They argued likewise against a resurrection of the dead, (if the rabbins do not misrepresent them) from the state of the dead body. *Dixit quidam* Sadducæus, R. Immi, *Dicitis mortuos esse resurrecturos, atqui in pulverem redacti sunt; pulvis autem num reviviscet?* apud *Wetstein*, in

sion that the soul died at the dissolution of its union with the body, would hinder their believing that the power of God could restore that union; or their believing those scriptures which were alledged to prove he would do it!

But to cut short the dispute, we deny the fact, and call upon the learned writer to prove, either by the scriptures or any other authentic record, that the Sadducees supported their opinion of no resurrection of the dead, upon a principle that the soul had no separate existence, on the peril of seeing his paraphrase of our Saviour's argument fall to rubbish, for want of a better foundation than a mere arbitrary postulatum.

As the author of the D. L. is not the only one who hath espoused and retailed this fancy, the challenge perhaps may appear somewhat hardy. But as it is so easy to trace it to its original, there is not much to be apprehended from the conflict. In one word, the learned author had this notion from Grotius or some of his transcribers. How Grotius came by it shall now be related.

Grotius, as we have seen, supposes our Saviour's argument to conclude directly for the future resurrection of the dead, particularly of the patriarchs. But Grotius likewise held the permanency, or the separate existence of the soul. And if you inquire why he did not conceive our Lord's argument to terminate in that, as the author of the D. L. has done, he an-

Matth. xxii. 30. where more may be seen to the same effect. The Sadducees argued no doubt, against a resurrection from many other topics. But their fundamental argument was the silence of the Mosaic writings.

swers, "that, though it might be a sufficient "refutation of the hypothesis of the Sadducees "to prove the permanency of the soul, yet he "conceives it to be more agreeable both to the "words and the purpose of our Lord (which "was to prove a resurrection) that Abraham "should receive not a soul, which is only a "part of Abraham, but a person consisting of "soul and body, to which [only] life and "death are properly applied."

What then was this hypothesis of the Sadducees that Grotius speaks of? It was, as he tells us, from Josephus, that the soul disappeared with, or did not remain after the death of the body. "Hence it follows, says Groti-"us, that there is no resurrection. For a re-"surrection requires the permanency of the "soul."

But this inference is entirely of Grotius's own devising. Josephus says not one word of it, nor makes the least mention of the opinion of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection of the dead. The Sadducæan doctrine of a future state, mentioned by Josephus, and cited by Grotius, is just the reverse of that of the Pharisees on the same subject. By considering therefore what, according to this historian, the Pharisees held, we may judge what, in his account, the Sadducees denied.

"The Pharisees, says Josephus, believed "that there was an immortal power [or virtue] "in the human soul. That rewards and pu-"nishments were dispensed under the earth, "to those who had done good or evil respec-"tively. That the one were kept in everlast-

" ing confinement; but the other easily found " the means to revive, or to live again."

What these means were he thus relates in another place. " The Pharisees hold all the " souls of men to be incorruptible or immortal, " but say that the souls of good men only pass " into other bodies; but that the souls of the " wicked are tormented with everlasting pu- " nishment."*

In opposition to this, the Sadducees are said to have held, " that the soul had no perma- " nency or power of immortality, and denied " all rewards and punishments in *Hades.*"

But what has all or any of this to do with the scripture doctrine of the resurrection of the dead? That these opinions concerning a future state, ascribed by Josephus to the Pharisees, were not the opinions of that sect in Paul's days, Paul himself is an unexceptionable witness.

I have hope towards GOD, *says he, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.* Acts xxiv. 15. Comp. chap. xxiii. 6. and xxvi. 8.†

* Ἀθανάτον τε ἰσχὺν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς [Φαρισαίοις] εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαίωσοις τε καὶ τιμὰς οἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιδεύσις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε. Καὶ ταῖς μὲν εἱργμὸν αἴδιον προσθήσεσθαι, ταῖς δὲ ῥᾳστώνην τε ἀναβίωσιν.—Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι. Jos. Antiq. xviii. c. I. §. 3. Hudson.

Φαρισαῖοι ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαύλων ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ—ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονήν, καὶ τὰς καθ' ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τὰς καθ' ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. Bell. Lib. II. c. 8. §. 14.

† *Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that* GOD *should raise the dead?* says our English testament. Why indeed? if these persons really believed, as Paul assured Felix they did, that GOD *would* raise the dead? Our translators, as well as some others, were unmindful that the Greek, in the common texts,

A resurrection you see, both of the just and unjust, was allowed by the Pharisees; and this was the doctrine which Paul preached; and this consequently the doctrine which our Saviour intended to prove directly to the Sadducees.

That the Pharisees should have changed their minds between the time of St. Paul, and the days of Josephus is altogether incredible, because we find them professing the doctrine of a general resurrection much later. The consequence is, that Josephus has misrepresented the doctrine of the Pharisees; and his inducement was this.

Josephus himself was a Pharisee. Had he spoken of the resurrection of the dead, as a doctrine of his own sect, the Romans probably would have mocked, as the Athenians did; and the prudent historian did not chuse to make himself and his sect ridiculous. He therefore (as many more both before him and after him have done) accommodated his doctrine to the taste of the pagans upon whom his preferment depended. This appears from his making the dispensation of rewards and punishments, to be under the earth, and from his representing the rewards of good men in the light of transmigration.* Nor would he, for the

was wrong pointed. They might however have easily discovered that, τι απιστον κρινεται, could never be greek for, *why should it be thought a thing incredible.* Some later editions have rectified the pointing—τι; απιστον κρινεται, e. q. s.——*What! is it thought an incredible thing among you* [is it not an article of *your* faith] *that* GOD *raiseth the dead?* That the pharisees should persecute him for preaching a doctrine they did not believe, would not have surprized Paul in the least.

* Critics, commentators, and paraphrasts upon the Scriptures, should look with particular attention to the consequences of their

same reason, mention that the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead ; for as he was representing the Pharisees and Sadducees as opposite sects, it must have been understood, that the Pharisees held whatever the Sadducees denied.

That Josephus was capable of acting the part here imputed to him, will receive a farther degree of credibility, from the following evidence.

At the end of this historian's works is commonly printed a tract, intituled Περὶ αὐτοκρατορος λογισμου containing an account of the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brethren, who were put to death by Antiochus Epiphanes for refusing to eat swine's flesh

This tract has been ascribed, with great uniformity, to Josephus, by writers of several ages, as far back as as Eusebius the ecclesiasti-

interpretations. When our Saviour had put the Sadducees to silence, one of the scribes *who had heard them reasoning together, perceived that* Jesus *had answered them well.* Mark xii. 28. This with the parallel place in Luke, was formerly urged as evidence that our Saviour's reasoning was not so new or astonishing as the author suggests. Remarks, p. 68. Be this as it may. One thing is clear : the scribes understood the argument, and approved it, as an additional support at least of the doctrine of the Pharisees on the subject of a future state. Suppose now Josephus to have truly represented this doctrine ; in what light must our Saviour's argument appear, if we suppose it to have no other direct tendency but to prove this more than semi-pagan system of Josephus? And where will this author meet with a more competent witness than Josephus, that the Pharisees, from our Saviour's time downwards, held the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul at all ? Grotius indeed was to blame for leading the author of the D. L. into this inconvenient situation. But this author was likewise to blame for not stopping where Grotius did, who knew better than to direct our blessed Lord's reasoning to the confutation only of his precarious hypothesis of the Sadducees.

cal historian.* It is to be found likewise at the end of the historical books of the old testament in the Alexandrine manuscript; and is from the age of this manuscript, very probably supposed to have had the sanction of the Jewish sanhedrim at Alexandria, which, as the learned author of the *Prolegomena* to the second volume of Grabe's septuagint observes, remained long after the times of Josephus.†

In this discourse several speeches are put into the mouth of Eleazar, but more especially of the brethren, expressing some hopes of immortality, but so obscurely and ambiguously, that one can only be certain, that the writer meant not to give his reader the most remote idea of a resurrection of the dead.

His own words, and those he ascribes to the sufferers on the subject, are such as these.

Don't think you can hurt us, as touching our souls, by your torments, even tho' you put us to death.—By means of this affliction, and our patience under it, we shall receive the rewards of virtue, and shall be with GOD.—As if he was transformed by the fire to incorruption or immortality.—By the glorious life of the pious I swear,—Behold my tongue hangeth out, cut it off; but you will not cut away with my tongue, [γλωσσοτομησεις] *my reasoning faculty* [λογισμον.]—*We have our reasoning faculty* [λογισμον] *unconquered.—Let us consecrate ourselves to GOD, with our whole heart who giveth us our souls, and let us use our bodies in keeping the law.—*

* See Gesner's Biblioth. Flavius. The testimonies in Hudson's edition of Josephus. *Fabricius* de *Josepho* et ejus scriptis.—Prolegom. to the second vol. of Grabe's Sept. chap iii. §. 7.

† Ibid. chap. i. prop. xxiv. §. 76.

Let us not fear him who thinketh he killeth the body; for great is the danger of the soul in eternal torment to those who transgress the commandments of GOD.—So shall Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob *receive us dying in their bosom, and all our fathers shall praise us.—All of them ready to die by these torments as if hastening to finish the journey to immortality.—Of the mother of these seven brethren it is said, she rather chose piety, which preserveth everlasting life with GOD.—As knowing that they who die for GOD, live unto GOD as* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, *and all the Patriarchs.*

There are several expressions in these citations, which will give the reader a very reasonable suspicion, that the author of this tract was no stranger to the christian scriptures; yet we see he studiously suppresses the capital doctrine of those scriptures, THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. In which he acts the very part that Josephus had done before him, who, undoubtedly, was well acquainted with the contents of the new testament, and indeed could not be ignorant, though he had never heard of these sacred writings, that the Pharisees held the resurrection of the dead.

But what seems to fix this tract upon Josephus by an internal evidence hardly to be disputed, is that, to get rid of this disagreeable doctrine of a resurrection, the author of it hath actually falsified the jewish record, from which he drew his account of these martyrs; I mean that which is preserved in the sixth and seventh chapters of the second book of Maccabees, where there is an account of the same martyrdom of Eleazer and the seven brethren; who

are represented as expressing their sentiments of futurity in terms that plainly denote the belief of a resurrection of the dead.

Thus CHAP. vi. 26. 27. *Eleazar* is made to say, *for though for the present time I should be delivered from the punishment of men, yet should I not escape the hand of the Almighty, neither alive nor dead. Wherefore now manfully changing* [διαλλαξας]* *this life, I will shew myself as mine age requireth.*

CHAP. vii. *v.* 9. The second [brother] when he was at the last gasp, said, *Thou like a fury takest us out of this present life, but the king of the world shall* raise us up, *who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life.*

Verses 10. 11. The executioners being about to cut off the *tongue* and *hands* of the third brother, he said, *These I had from heaven, and for his laws I despise them, and from him* I hope to have them again.

Verse 14. The fourth brother said, *It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from* GOD, to be raised up again *by him.*

Verse 23. The mother expresses her confidence that *the creator of the world, who formed the generation of man, would also give her sons* breath and life again.

Verse 36. The youngest says that his brethren *were dead under God's covenant of everlasting life.*

From these particulars it is evident, that the writer of this history represents these martyrs, as expecting that *God's covenant of everlasting life,* would be fulfilled by *raising the dead.*

* Παλιν δε αλλαγησομεθα. 1 Cor. xv. 51.

The learned author of the D. L. holds the writer of the second book of *Maccabees* in the extremest contempt, and talks somewhere of his *frighting himself with the size of his own lye.*

Be that as it will, the commentators on Heb. xi. (and among them the author of the D. L. himself) constantly and unanimously refer to this history, upon that clause, at *v.* 35. *Others were tortured,* [ετυμπανισθησαν] *not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection* : which besides that it exhibits a case to be found, in all its particulars, in this and no other part of the jewish history upon record, is circumstantial enough to point out the very engine of torture [τυμπανον] made use of in the martyrdom of Eleazar. 2. *Macca.* vi. 19. 28.

There is therefore just as much credit due to this historian, as the citation of an apostle can give him ; which is more indeed in the present case than we have occasion to employ, as we want him only to testify, what were the sentiments of his countrymen concerning a future state, at the time he wrote and published his history.

The result is, that if Josephus was the person who composed the discourse περι αυτοκραλορος λογισμε, he has plainly falsified the record from which he took his account of this martyrdom ; a circumstance which, in its turn, in some measure, fixes the said tract upon him, as he has been already detected in belying the principles of his own sect, in that very point wherein the record is falsified, with respect to the sentiments of Eleazar and the seven brethren.

The moderns indeed are divided in their opinions concerning the author of this tract. Erasmus and Arnold Arlenius, commonly called *Peraxylus*, ascribe it, with high encomiums, to Josephus the historian of the Jews.* Grotius thinks it was the work of some other Josephus.† Dr. Hudson will not hear of its belonging to his historian.‡ But Mr. Lowth, the learned commentator on the prophets, seems to have examined it with accuracy, and to have thought it the legitimate offspring of Flavius Josephus, excepting the last paragraph, which contains an account given by the mother of the seven brethren, how she was educated, and spent the early part of her life before marriage. This, the learned Lowth thought was the forgery of some impertinent sophist, and Dr. Hudson himself, or his editor, was of opinion, that it was the work of a different hand from that of the author of the discourse:‖ which I the rather mention, as among a heap of texts, brought to shew the grounds upon which the Jews believed a future state, Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones is appealed to, as if a resurrection of the dead had been an article in the creed of this matron and her sons. An intimation so repugnant to the general tenor of the rest of the piece (whether this was the inducement to the learned critics above-mentioned to condemn it or not) that no other proof is wanting to determine the illegitimacy of

* Gesner. Biblioth. ubi supra.—† Apud fabricium ubi supra.
‡ Preface to Hudson's Josephus.—‖ See the note of the editor of Hudson's Josephus upon this paragraph.

this paragraph.* But to return to the more authentic scriptures of the new testament.

That the Pharisees held, and the Sadducees denied, a general resurrection of the dead is clear from the scriptures of the new testament. But that the Pharisees held, or that the Sadducees denied a separate existence of the soul the scriptures say not.

There is indeed nothing that looks like it, except the words, Σαδδδκαιοι μεν λεγουσι μη ειναι— ΠΝΕΥΜΑ Upon which Grotius himself observes that πνευμα in that passage does not mean the human spirit or soul in a state of separation from the body, "but the divine *afflatus*, by "which the Pharisees rightly believed the pro- "phets were inspired." Which interpretation is confirmed by the use of the words spirit and angel in the next verse. *If a* spirit *or an* angel *have spoken unto him*, says our translation; where, without all doubt, the word πνευμα stands for the *spirit of God;* and the meaning is, *if he hath had any particular revelation.*

Give the word πνευμα the signification of, soul, and the Sadducees must be understood to have absolutely denied the existence of the human soul, either in union with the body or out of

* I muſt here own my obligations to a learned perſon long ſince deceaſed, from whoſe MSS I firſt had the hint of the difference between the ſecond book of Maccabees, and this tract aſcribed to Joſephus. The gentleman I mean was Henry Layton, Eſq. of whom the reader will find ſome account in the defence of the Remarks, &c. ſubjoined to this review. Upon the whole, whether this tract came immediately from the hand of Joſephus or not, is not very material in reſpect of the uſe I would make of it. The theology of this writer, on the ſubject of a future ſtate, and that of Joſephus is the very ſame, and evidently came out of the ſame pagan ſchool. And the ſophiſt (if ſuch he was) has ſuſtained the perſon of his maſter, with great propriety and conſiſtency.

it; as Grotius himself plainly saw.* In which case, the paraphrase in the D. L. might as well have introduced the Sadducees speaking

* For he plainly saw that μη ειναι ἀγγελους, signified there were absolutely no such beings as angels; and thereupon expressed his surprize, "that the Sadducees should deny the existence of angels, "seeing they received the writings of Moses, which mentioned an-"gels so frequently." To account for this, Grotius supposes the opinion of the Sadducees concerning angels, to have been the same with that which some Jews contemporary with Justin Martyr held; namely, that angels were undivided and inseparable powers or virtues of God, which God, when he pleases, makes to dart out, [of himself] and contracts [or draws] into himself again. And upon this supposition, Grotius, unwilling as it should seem, to trust to the naked testimony of Josephus, forms a presumptive argument, that the Sadducees, who had this notion of angels, *might in like manner* think "that the souls of men were not such beings as could subsist "of themselves, but, being destitute of bodies, must fall to nothing." But, besides, that this subtile speculation on the nature of angels, has much more of a rabbinical than a Sadducæan complexion, it happens unluckily for Grotius, that this fancy relates only to a particular mode of existence, and does not at all imply a total suspension of the ministry of angels, which is the least we can suppose the Sadducees to have asserted on this subject. The Sadducees, I suppose, would hardly deny either that there had been such beings as angels, or truly divine inspiration, during the life of Moses. But Moses having made up the law before his death, the Sadducees most probably insisted that the law was from thenceforward sufficient for all exigencies, without any occasional interposition of angels, or prophets with new inspirations. An opinion for which the licentious traditions and legends of the jewish doctors would afford a very plausible colour. Nor does it appear that the sect of the Sadducees was ever heard of, till these traditions became so extravagant. The Sadducees seem to have been a sort of jewish protestants; at least they were not such knaves or fools as some wrong-headed moderns would make them. [See Bayle's Dict. Sadducees. Who, by the way, observes that Josephus either did not understand, or did not truly report the doctrine of the Sadducees on another subject. Rem. (C)] Even the cavil against a resurrection which they proposed to our Saviour, receives its whole force from the pharisaical notion of carnal and sensual enjoyments in a future state, as has been observed elsewhere. See Remarks, &c. p. 59.

Irish, as talking of the dissolution of the union of what in their opinion did not exist, with something whose existence they acknowledged.

But let us now suppose for a moment, that the Sadducees really held this principle of no separate existence in terms: and let us look a little into the merit of that reasoning which has been ascribed to them, and to our Saviour's confutation of them, upon that supposition.

Grotius leads the way, and he puts the argument into the mouth of the Sadducee, in this form.

"The resurrection of the body requires the permanency of the soul.

"But the soul dies with the body.

"Therefore no resurrection of the body."

Grotius, had he set himself to subvert this reasoning in form, would, as appears by his annotation on the 32d verse, have granted the major, and denied the minor of this syllogism. And had you asked him why the resurrection of the body required or supposed the permanency of the soul? I conjecture he would have answered, as the common hypothesis suggests, that the body could not be made alive without being united to a soul; and therefore, if there were no soul subsisting to which the body might be united, there could be no resurrection of the body.

This indeed is the only reason that can be given, why a resurrection should require the permanency of the soul, more than the permanency of the body. But Grotius did not go even thus far. Having made this syllogism

for the Sadducees, and plainly diffident of his authority for fixing this hypothesis upon them, he wisely left the argument to be pursued or answered, by those whom it might concern more than it concerned him.

Then comes Le Clerc, and he picks up these hints from Grotius, and, I dare say, thought he made the very most of them in the following representation.

"With respect to the Sadducees, to prove "the immortality of the soul or the resurrec- "tion, was the same thing; because they did "not deny the latter [the resurrection], but "on the supposition that the soul died with "the body; which could not be raised again "to serve for the mansion of a soul which was "no more; and which having been destroyed, "could not return thither any more."

Le Clerc, we see, sets out with making it a matter of indifference to the Sadducees, whether the resurrection of the body was proved to them through the medium of the separate existence of the soul, or the separate existence, through the medium of the resurrection. And yet, the very reason he gives for this, namely, "that the Sadducees did not deny the resur- "rection, but on the supposition, that the "soul died with the body," implies that no proof of a resurrection would affect the Sadducees, which did not previously establish the immortality or the separate existence of the soul.

But, however, Le Clerc having before made our Saviour's argument against the Sadducees conclude immediately for the resurrection of the dead, he could not decently desert his own

interpretation. And therefore, to preserve his consistency, he illustrates his leading proposition by shewing how the separate existence of the soul, might be inferred through the medium of the resurrection of the body; supposing perhaps that Grotius had sufficiently suggested the alternative. "The body, says he, cannot "be raised again to serve for the mansion of "a soul which is no more, and which having "been destroyed, cannot return to the body." Prove therefore, that the body will be raised again, and the separate existence of the soul follows of course. And in this indeed does the above-mentioned reason for the permanency of the soul end. Prove that the body will be made alive, and the consequence is, that there is a soul subsisting to which it must be united. But how Grotius or Le Clerc would have proved that the soul does not die with the body, previously to their proving the resurrection of the body; or having proved the separate existence, how they would have inferred the resurrection of the body through that medium, appears not from any thing that either of them has said.

And now advances the learned author of the D. L. and he, taking Le Clerc's word, *that the Sadducees did not deny the resurrection, but upon the supposition that the soul died with the body*, and not examining either the fact or the presumption on which Grotius erected the supposed hypothesis of the Sadducees, imagined that the negative argument against a resurrection, exhibited by Grotius, might be turned into a positive one for it. And in the fullness

of this conceit, to work he goes with the text under consideration.

But unable to find a proposition which might correspond to Grotius's major; or, in other words, unable to give a reason why the separate existence of the soul required the resurrection of the body, he was obliged to leave his medium and his inference destitute of all connexion; and comes but poorly off by saying, "that "the principle of no separate existence being "once overthrown, the Sadducees had nothing "to oppose to the writings of the prophets, "or the preaching of Jesus;" which, besides being false in fact, and contradictory to the very text he was explaining, turns the Sadducees over for conviction to a direct authority for the resurrection of the dead; in which the separate existence of the soul has no more concern than the separate existence of the moon, namely, the word of God.

Grotius indeed appears to have been sensible of the impropriety of arguing from a separate existence to a resurrection, or *vice versa*, upon any principles arising from the nature of things in the abstract: he observes, "that for the "sustentation of the soul in a state of separa- "tion from the body, the scriptures do not "refer us to natural reasons, but to the power "and will of God."* Which principles of

* This conceſſion was the more ingenuous in Grotius, inaſmuch as he believed, that "phyſical reaſons taken from the operations of "the mind, might be brought to prove, that the ſoul has an un- "changeable permanency from its origin." Theſe phyſical reaſons have ſince been turned into demonſtrations of the ſoul's immortality, through the medium of its immateriality, and offered in aid of revelation; from which, ſome writers would make us believe, the immor-

sustentation, the learned author of the D. L. having interwoven into his own paraphrase, he hath evidently proved against himself, that our Saviour never thought of inferring the resurrection of the body, thro' the medium of the separate existence of the soul.

II.

In the last edition of the D. L. the ingenious author hath subjoined a note to the foregoing paraphrase, the propriety of which, depending upon the validity of the said paraphrase we must take the liberty to controvert.

"Which (meaning the foregoing interpretation of our Saviour's reasoning) unanswerably confutes the semi-pagan dream of the "soul's sleeping till the resurrection of the "body." D. L. vol. ii. p. ii. p. 346.

tality of man cannot be ſufficiently proved without this phyſical demonſtration. Thus Bp. Stillingfleet, arguing againſt Mr. Locke (who denied that the immmateriality of the ſoul could be phyſically demonſtrated) thought fit to ſay:—"It takes off very much from the "evidence of immortality, if it depends wholly upon God's giving "that which of its own nature it is not capable of."——Mr. Locke replies, "any one's not being able to demonſtrate the ſoul to be "immaterial, takes off not very much, nor at all, from the evidence "of its immortality, if God has revealed that it ſhall be immortal; "becauſe the veracity of God is a demonſtration of the truth of what "he has revealed, [and the want of another demonſtration of a pro-"poſition demonſtratively true, takes not off from the evidence of "it.] For where there is a clear demonſtration, there is as much "evidence as any truth can have, that is not ſelf-evident." Bp. Stillingfleet, I ſuppoſe, did not live to rejoin; but his Lordſhip has had the ſingular felicity of retaining an advocate after his demiſe, in the perſon of a Britiſh Biographer, who ſeems to have undertaken Mr. Locke's article, for the ſake of making the *amende honorable* for him to his adverſaries of all complexions. Let us attend, however, to his operations on this occaſion. "Here, ſays he, the ſophiſm is "notorious, in calling ſcripture proof a demonſtration, which is not "pretended to riſe above a moral certainty or a ſufficient probability, "and therefore undoubtedly admits of degrees, and muſt needs be "leſs, where there is no internal evidence from the nature of the

Unanswerably indeed! for thus stands the confutation. "Either you or I misunderstand "our Saviour's reasoning. But it is not I, "Therefore it is you."

The remaining merits of this confutation we shall consider presently. In the mean time we go on with the note.

"thing." The reader will here observe that it is the veracity of God, and not scripture proof, that Mr. Locke calls a demonstration. So far as Mr. Locke concerns himself with scripture proof, he puts it hypothetically, if God has revealed that the soul shall be immortal. This point was taken for granted, both by the Bishop, and Mr Locke. And the question between them is this, and this only, viz. "whether, supposing God to have declared that he will give the soul "immortality, that is not a clear demonstration (which stands in need "of no additional evidence to make it complete) that the soul will "have immortality, whether it may or may not be proved that the "soul is naturally capable of immortality." If the Biographer therefore, would defend the Bishop, or confute Mr. Locke, he must prove the veracity of God rises no higher than moral certainty, ——admits of degrees,——and is less where there is no internal evidence from the nature of the thing. Such is the luck of those who go about to fix sophisms on this great master of reasoning. But we have not yet done with this accute Biographer. "Upon this "account, continues he, we see St. Paul did not think it enough "barely to declare the resurrection and immortality of the body, but "took pains to inforce the credibility of it by an argument from "the analogy of nature." Which is using St. Paul very little better than he has done Mr. Locke. For 1. the apostle is so far from attributing the reproduction of grain to nature, that he expressly says, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." 2. He adds "and to every seed its own body, i. e. a body raised, as well as "sown in corruption." Which to be sure is an excellent analogical argument for the resurrection of a body sown in corruption, and raised in incorruption. The honest man mistook an argument drawn from the power of God, for an argument drawn from the analogy of nature. "God hath infinitely diversified and distinguished the works "of the creation by different properties and different degrees of glory "and dignity; according to his good pleasure, and the different "uses to which he hath allotted them." The consequence, and the only consequence the apostle intended, or indeed could draw from the premises is, "therefore he is able to quicken, raise, immor-

" And yet, what is strange to tell, this very " text in the course of disputation, which, like " the course of time, brings things as the poet " says,

—*To their confounding contraries,*

" hath been urged to prove *that sleep*, or *no* " *separate life ;* and this by no less considerable " a man than Mr. Hales of Eton."

That things should be brought to their confounding contraries, where two disputants are contending about the meaning of a particular text, is not quite so strange to tell, as that, one and the same writer should alledge certain texts, as the genuine sentiments of an orthodox Jew, to prove one thing, and again should urge the very same texts, as the personated sentiments of a pagan sage to prove another.

" talize and glorify the human body, even infinitely beyond its na- " tural capacities." But surely arguments from what God has done, to what he can do, afford no analogical demonstration of what he will do. For the demonstration of that, we must go to the veracity of his declarations. But all this still relates only to the immortality of the body ; and we should be glad to know what analogies there are in scripture, to prove the immortality of the soul ? None at all, it seems. " For the immortality of the soul is rather supposed than " proved, wherever its condition of happiness or misery in that state " is explained." So had Tillotson said before him. And the plain English of it is, that they could find no proof in the scriptures of the immortality of the soul, out of its connexion with the compound man or person. And just as little is there to be found of its condition of happiness or misery in a state of immortality, out of the said connexion. Whence it follows, that the evidence of the soul's immortality drawn from the nature of the thing, is a sort of evidence totally unrelated to that in the scriptures, of the immortality of man ; and neither adds to it, nor takes from it one jot or one tittle.---May we not hope that the character of this illustrious philosopher, an honour and at the same time a blessing to his country, will be rescued from the petulant detraction of this biographer in other instances, purchased, as it should seem, by Mr. Locke's political principles.

Mr. Hales of Eton was a considerable man indeed, and would have been no less considerable for urging this text in the manner, and for the purpose mentioned in the note. But indeed he was guiltless of what is here laid to his charge, to whatever it may amount. The collectors of those tracts which appear under the name of the *Phœnix*, and of which, an English translation of the *Brevis Disquisitio* is one, too easily believed, the conjectural accounts of the Doctors Ward and Heylen, who mention Hales as the person to whom that sensible pamphlet had been ascribed by common fame.* It is now known, upon better grounds, that the *Brevis Disquisitio* was the work of *Joachimus Stegmannus*, a Socinian divine.†

But as the investigation of truth does not so immediately depend upon our knowing who writes any thing, as what is written, the mistake is of no great consequence. And, prejudice apart, there is so much good sense and solid reasoning in what the learned annotator hath cited from this disquisition, that unless he had been both able and willing to unfold that complication of mistakes, which he condemns in the lump, there was no great policy

* See Par's life of Abp. Uſher, p. 473. and Heylin's life of Laud, p. 361.

† Gen. Dict. vol. V. p. 703. Note [E] and Biograph. Brit. vol. IV. Art. Hales [John] Note [I] It is ſomewhere lamented "that learning ſeemed to be retiring to Dictionary-makers and compilers of Magazines," whither, we may well ſuppoſe, it is below great ſcholars to follow it. We ſee however, by this inſtance, the expedience of a little condeſcenſion upon ſome occaſions. Though Mr. Hales was not, yet Stegman was probably too inconſiderable to divert this eminent writer a ſingle moment from his immediate purpoſe. Not to mention an obſervation of his own concerning the benefit of general reading.

in directing his reader to an interpretation, which, in the present circumstances of both, has so manifest an advantage over his own.

For example. The learned author of the D. L. concludes from this text, that the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are yet existing in a separate state. "This, he says, is the "force of the argument;" and there he leaves it.

Now, if you oppose this state of separate existence, to the sleep of the soul, it must be a state of conscious existence; and, in reference to the appellation, the God of Abraham, a state of happy existence. For surely it could not be, in the account of our blessed Saviour, a state into the idea of which personality did not enter, and to which no rewards might be annexed.

To this representation then Stegman objects, "That in this view the argument would be al- "together fallacious. For if, before the re- "surrection, these patriarchs felt heavenly joy, "God would be their God, or benefactor, "(namely according to their souls) although "their bodies should never rise again."

So that, in this sense, the reasoning of the paraphrase, instead of proving that there will be a resurrection of the dead, goes well nigh to prove that there will be none.

Has any thing been offered to support the paraphrase against this fatal objection? Yes, you are told, "it is a mere complication of "mistakes, as is indeed his whole reasoning "from scripture throughout that chapter." 'Tis well that Mr. Hales is not really concerned in this censure, which, resting as it does

upon the annotator's bare word, might otherwise have found some difficulty in gaining the suffrage of those, who should take the pains to compare the ingenious annotator's way of reasoning from scripture, with that of the said Mr. Hales.

" But they, continues the note, who hold " the soul to be only a quality, and yet talk " of its sleep between death and the resurrecti- " on, use a jargon which confounds all lan- " guage as well as reason. For such a sleep " is an annihilation, and the waking again, a " new creation."

What is this to the supposed Mr. Hales? Nothing. But something must be said to cover this plain tergiversation. The questions are, whether the powers of thought and conscious perception with which the living man is endued, are or are not totally suspended between death and the resurrection? And, whether the text under consideration decides the point either way? What satisfaction is it, in the course of such an inquiry, to be told, that somebody, whom nobody knows, has thought and spoken absurdly concerning the human soul?

But here lies the trick, (for a trick there is in it) only fix upon these *semi-pagan dreamers*, by whatever contrivance you may, the doctrine of the soul's annihilation at the death of the body, and the very odium of the tenet will excuse you from the trouble of confuting their arguments. And yet methinks the contrivance, in the present instance, is but a clumsy one. For allow the human body to have been CREATED as well as the human soul,

and to talk of its sleep, when it is reduced to its primitive earth, is the very same sort of jargon with that of which the ingenious annotator hath given us a specimen. And whether you use it in speaking of a quality or a substance, is the very same sort of jargon still.

III.

It belongs not to this place to defend the cause of any of those learned writers who have dissented from the author of the D. L. in other instances. I enter not into their interests, nor is there occasion for it. But the learned Dr. Rutherforth having started a difficulty which has produced a long note in the last edition of the D. L. relative to the text in question, the reader's patience is requested, while two or three remarkable particulars are pointed out in the said note, for the sake of the aspect they wear towards the foregoing paraphrase.

The learned professor observes, "that though "our Saviour's argument was a new one, and "though the Pharisees had never made this "inference,——yet as the argument was con- "clusive, as the inference might have been "made, it will prove that Moses was not stu- "dious to conceal the doctrine of a future life, "nor purposely omitted every thing that "might bring his reader acquainted with those "notices of redemption, &c. with which the "patriarchs were favoured."

To this the note replies, that Moses might bring a conclusive argument for a doctrine which nevertheless he was studious to conceal.

"Roger Bacon gave a true receipt to make "gunpowder, and yet was studious to conceal

" the composition. Moses, in like manner, " omitted the doctrine of another life, in his " institute, but at the same time interwove " into the law such a secret mark of this truth, " that when the other institution came, it " might be clear to all, that he both knew and " believed it; and that till then it was his " purpose it should be concealed, appears in " that the Jews, who, on the ceasing of the " extraordinary providence, continued for " many ages with incessant labour to ransack " their bibles for the proof of a future state, " could never find this secret mark, or draw " the inference in proof of a future state from " the words---I am the God of Abraham, &c. " till Jesus taught them."

Upon which state of the case, be it observed in passing,

1. That if Moses had left the doctrine of a future state in his writings, in the same circumstances that Bacon left his receipt to make gunpowder, it could not have been said with any truth, either that he omitted or studiously concealed that doctrine. The account of this matter the learned annotator had from Bacon's article in the *Biographia Britannica*, note [p], where the reader may be informed, that Bacon did not give the true receipt to make gunpowder, even in the anagrammatic state he did give it, till he was no longer studious to conceal the composition.

2. The argument from what the Jews did not, to what they could not find in this text, may be an argument for the omission; but if you carry it farther, it is just as conclusive

against Moses's knowledge or belief of a future state, as for his studiously concealing it.

But this is not my business with this note. The annotator informs us, "that Moses, by "interweaving this secret mark of his know-"ledge and belief of a future state into the "law, laid the grounds on which that doctrine "arises, and thereby provided a proof of that "connexion between the two dispensations, "necessary to shew the harmony between their "respective authors." Now,

1. This *secret mark*, in the present case, is no other than the argument for a future state, couched in those words, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. But this argument, according to the learned annotator, goes no farther than the proof of the separate existence of the soul. How then should this secret mark shew the harmony between the author of the christian, and that of the Jewish dispensation, any more than between Moses, and the authors of the Egyptian dispensation, who are said to have held the separate existence of the soul, and that upon full as good grounds, as Moses is said to have known or believed it?

2. The connection between the mosaic and christian dispensations, must depend upon the evidence contained in the former, that the law was to be fulfilled by Christ, in the office and character of Saviour of the world. But has the doctrine of the separate existence of the soul, any thing to do with this office and character of Christ? The separate existence of the soul is not supposed to be a future life, either appropriated to Abraham and the patriarchs by promise, or conveyed through them to the

test of mankind. If the doctrine of the sleep of the soul after the death of the body, is but a dream, the souls of all men who died before Christ must have existed separately from the time of their respective deaths. Does this kind of life depend in any degree upon Christ the Saviour? To suppose this, would be to suppose that the redemption had taken effect before the Redeemer appeared to execute his office. For any thing therefore, that the disinvelopement of this secret mark contributed towards shewing the connection between the two dispensations, the doctrine contained in it, according to the annotator's interpretation, was and would have been an everlasting truth, although the second dispensation had never been heard of.

3. The note informs us, that "the Jews, "who, on the ceasing of the extraordinary "providence, continued for many ages with "incessant labour to ransack their bibles for "the proof of a future state, could never "[from these words, *I am the God of Abra-* "*ham*, &c.] draw the inference [in proof of "the separate life of the soul] till Jesus taught "them." And as, when the inference was once drawn, this text, according to our author, became "as plain a text as any in the "whole bible;" we may well suppose these Jews had no better success with other texts. —And yet the learned author of the D. L. in a period that stands in view of the beginning of this very note (utterly forgetful, it should seem, of all the foregoing non-personality, refusion, &c.) affirms, and pretends to have proved, that the early Jews (who doubtless

lived before the extraordinary providence had ceased) inferred the *separate* existence of the soul, from some other passage or passages of the writings of Moses.

Unfortunate Moses! studious to conceal a doctrine, of which however he was obliged to leave a secret mark in his writings, he succeeds so ill, that his doctrine was found out, *suo ipsius indicio*, by the early Jews, who, living under an extraordinary providence, had no need of it; and yet, the same doctrine was so effectually concealed from the later Jews, who, living after the extraordinary providence had ceased, seem to have had some claim to a succedaneum, that they could not find it, even after ransacking their bibles, with incessant labour, for many ages!

Hath not the facetious annotator made the learned professor ample amends, for sneering his utter ignorance of the nature and genius of the mosaic dispensation? But,

4. "The Jews, says the learned annotator, "who, on the ceasing of the extraordinary "providence, continued for many ages with "incessant labour, to ransack their bibles for "the proof of a future state, could never draw "the inference till Jesus taught them."

What inference does he mean? The inference in proof of a separate existence of the soul? But the annotator himself allows elsewhere, that "a future state was a national "doctrine of the Jews in the times of the "Maccabees."* Whence we may suppose

* D. L. vol. IV. p. 361. A secret which this author seems to have learned from *Lucas Brugensis*, annot. in Matt. iii. 7. where, by the way, may be seen the Ichnography of the D. L. not ob-

that, though from the words, *I am the* GOD *of Abraham, &c.* the Jews did not infer a separate existence, they might infer a resurrection of the dead. That they inferred the future happiness of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, from something, is pretty plain from some passages in the new testament. And that the national doctrine of a future state among the Maccabæan Jews, was the doctrine of a resurrection, is equally plain from a record of those times, authenticated by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But this would spoil the newness of our Saviour's argument, and that would be equivalent to spoiling the newness of our author's paraphrase, which however must be supported at all events.

And therefore, that the novelty of the argument may not wholly rest on the credit of the D. L. we are referred to a citation of Dr. Pocock, importing, "that it appears from the astonish-"ment of the multitude, that our Saviour "used a clearer argument against the Sadducees, "than any the Pharisees had ever used be-"fore." Which is, and would have been very credible, though the astonishment of the multitude had not been mentioned. And indeed, on that very account it is utterly incredible our blessed Lord should make the resurrection of the dead, the subject of an argument which only concludes for the separate existence of the soul.

scurely delineated. One might, on this account, have expected to find this fame Lucas in the Index of proper names, and where quoted. But not a word of him at the end of either volume. They who are curious to see the passage and have not Brugensis himself, may find in it Bayle's Dictionary. Art. [Sadducees.] Rem. [A.]

But Dr. Pocock does by no means give the author of the D. L. leave to say or to suppose that the Jews had never argued (though more confusedly and obscurely) for a future state from this text, as this author would insinuate, by representing them as ransacking their bibles, without success.

For the rest, the taking away the key of knowledge from the multitude, will serve just as well to account for their astonishment, as the novelty of the argument. The author of the D. L. indeed talks "of arguments for "and against a future state, long hacknied in "the schools and synagogues of the Pharisees;" and, consequently, in the hearing of the people. He had read that this was the case, about the time when the Sadducees arose, and he would needs imagine, it must be the case even down to the time of our Saviour; not considering the impropriety of these public altercations, in reference to the common interest both the Pharisees and Sadducees had to keep up the dignity of their character with the people over whom they presided in common. There is indeed no trace of any such altercation in the new testament, except the tumult which happened on Paul's account: Acts xxiii. the circumstances of which are equal to a thousand witnesses, that the masters of Israel, who well knew the genius of the people, would never hackney such a question in their schools and synagogues, whatever they might do in more private parties.

IV.

Some remarks on the exposition of the parable of the Rich man *and* Lazarus. *Luke* xvi. *Divine Legation,* vol. IV. p. 349. ed. 1758.

The only inducement I have to accompany the learned author of the D. L. in his exposition of this parable, is an odd question, thrust into the middle of it in this last edition, and so hedged about, that there is no coming at it without breaking into the exposition itself.

From the words, *If they hear not* Moses *and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one arose from the dead*, it is concluded, it seems, by the objectors to the D. L. "that "Moses and the prophets taught a future state "of rewards and punishments, as plainly as if "one came back from that state to tellus so." To this it is answered, "that the parable be- "ing spoken to the PHARISEES, the great pa- "trons of a future state, it cannot be suppo- "sed that they should be sent to Moses and "the prophets to learn that doctrine, as an ar- "ticle of faith. Accordingly Lazarus's report, "and consequently, the instruction to be had "from Moses and the prophets, aims only at "repentance." As thus,

"If they will not hear Moses and the pro- "phets, whose authority they acknowledge, and "whose missions were confirmed by so many "and well attested miracles, neither will they "regard a new one, the resurrection of a dead "man. [] Now Moses and the prophets have "denounced the most severe threatnings on "the part of God, against vice and impenitence."

"This, says the learned writer, is the force "of the argument, in which we see the questi-

" on of a future state is no more concerned than " thus far only, that God will punish either here " or hereafter." And what the Pharisees would understand by hereafter, was, we are told, a state were all inequalities should be set even, and God's threats and promises executed to the full.

Thus stood the argument in the former edition of the D. L. sufficiently plain and conclusive, at least for the learned author's purpose. What then could be his motive for throwing all that had been said, and all that was going to be said, into confusion, by inserting in this last edition, where the brackets are marked above, the following strange question ?

" [And in fact were the Pharisees at all " softened into repentance by the return of " Lazarus, the namesake of him in the parable, " whom Jesus raised from the dead ?]"

What the two Lazaruses have to do together, save that they are namesakes, would be utterly unaccountable to one who should not reflect, how unsafe it was to leave the argument above-recited in its pristine state of perspicuity. For thus stood the case. The learned author, having made the reward and punishment represented in the parable to be final, namely, *the setting even all inequalities, and the full execution of God's threats and promises*, had for ever deprived the patrons of the doctrine of a separate existence of any farther aid from this parable, which had all along been their sheet-anchor. Nay the learned critic, by this construction, had even deprived himself of the benefit of an observation of his

own, importing "that ἅδης, in the new testa-
"ment, signifies the receptacle of separate spi-
"rits."

For this some amends must needs be made by the learned writer, on the peril of hearing it from his orthodox brethren. Accordingly, Lazarus of Bethany is introduced, in the manner above-mentioned, as having testified to the Pharisees,—what? why, what he had heard and seen in his state of separate existence; the learned writer, not considering that the report of what passed in a state that was *not* final, must quite overset the conclusion he supposes the Pharisees would draw from the representation in the parable.

The D. L. indeed, puts the impression intended to be made upon the Pharisees entirely upon the circumstance of the new miracle, without taking the least notice of the testimony, which the Lazarus of the parable was to bear to the five brethren; the learned writer well knowing that such a testimony must of course imply, that the persons to whom it was offered, were unbelievers with respect to the thing testified; a supposition that would by no means suit the exposition of this parable exhibited in the D. L. And yet, instances of miracles wrought with a view of bringing men to repentance, without previously convincing them of something they did not believe, are surely not very common.

But of all the miracles recorded in the bible, the resurrection of Lazarus of Bethany, will least admit of a supposition of that sort. The uniform end of it is thus repeated, John xi. 14. *Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is*

dead, and I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent that ye may believe. In which expression we can hardly suppose the repentance of the disciples of our Lord to be included. 42. *Because of the people that stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.* And this effect it had upon the people that stood by, and upon others, through their testimony. 45. *Then many of the Jews that came to Mary when they saw the things that Jesus did, believed on him.* xii. 11. *Because of him* [*Lazarus*] *many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus.* 17, 18. *The people that were with him when he called Lazarus out of the grave, and raised him from the dead, bare record; for this cause also the people met him, for that they had heard that he had done this miracle.* The same idea had the Pharisees of the *end* of this miracle. xi. 47. *If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him.* xii. 19. *Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold the world is gone after him;* that is, all men are become *believers* in him. Not a syllable in all this, or in any part of the context, of what Lazarus had seen or heard in a state of separate existence. Not a tittle of any report he made to the Pharisees of a place of torment, or of any exhortation to repentance, grounded on such report.

Possibly it will be said, "that to believe a "future state of rewards and punishments, "and to believe on Jesus, are different things." I would answer, perhaps not, in the event. But be it so; still the miracle must work faith in Jesus, before it could operate upon the Pharisees to repentance; and then the repentance

would be the effect of something very different from the testimony of a man raised from the dead, for the purpose mentioned in the parable.

To make the cases parallel, or to make the case of Lazarus of Bethany of use to illustrate the other, it must be supposed, that his separate spirit had been a witness of the torments of the separate spirits of the wicked in *Hades;*—that it was called from thence, and reunited to its body by our Lord, on purpose to bear testimony to the awful truth, and to persuade the Pharisees in consequence of this report, to repent;—that Lazarus, thus restored to mortal life, delivered his message with all the solemnity due to the importance of it, was heard, rejected, and despised; and all this, to verify the judgment passed upon the Pharisees by our Lord; namely, that, *if they heard not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded, though one arose from the dead.* So that the most illustrious miracle of the new testament (excepting the resurrection of our Lord himself) must have been wrought in vain.

Let us now hear another comment on a like event. "Who can imagine the surprise of "Dorcas (says the famous Mr. John Wesley) "when called back to life? Or of her friends "when they saw her alive? For the sake of "themselves, there was cause of rejoicing; "and much more for such a confirmation of the "Gospel. But to herself it was matter of re- "signation, not of joy, to be called back to "these scenes of vanity; which surely would "not have been tolerable, had not a veil of

" oblivion been drawn over the glories which " her separate spirit had enjoyed."*

What is now to be done? This *veil of oblivion* would totally disable Lazarus of Bethany from being such a preacher of repentance to the Pharisees, as his namesake in the parable was intended to be. And yet without it, Lazarus, who, doubtless, had been in the happy region of *Hades*, must have lived after his resurrection, according to Mr. Wesley, in a state of intolerable regret and anxiety.

The case with Mr. Wesley, was plainly this. Dorcas, to his great mortification, has left no account, that can be found, of what her separate spirit had seen or heard in the enjoyment of its glories. Instead of concluding from hence, as a cooler head would have done, that the separate spirit of Dorcas had seen or heard nothing, he stumbles upon this commodious *veil of oblivion*, which, besides accounting for the absence of her narrative, leaves his own warm fancy to imagine whatever he pleases; even to imagine that Dorcas, notwithstanding her *veil of oblivion*, might be infinitely surprised when called back to life.

These imaginations, and twenty more, equally absurd and inconsistent, with our Gospel-evidence of eternal life through Christ, have not perhaps received greater countenance among christian believers, from any part of scripture, than from this parable of the rich man and Lazarus. On this the papists build their purgatory, and on this have the various

* Explanatory notes on Acts ix. 40.

schemes of an intermediate state in protestant systems, been projected and ornamented with all the fantastical imagery a rhetorical or an enthusiatic genius could suggest; and all from a firm persuasion that this parable contained a real representation of what passes in a state of separate existence.

On which account the learned author of the D. L. (be this said without derogating from his great merit in other respects) has not perhaps performed a more essential service to the christian religion in all his elaborate work, than by shewing, as he has done, that the rewards and punishments described in this parable are final; and, consequently, that nothing in favour of an intermediate, or a separate state of existence between death and the resurrection, can be inferred from the contents of it.

But though I agree with the learned writer in this, and another particular of his exposition to be mentioned presently, yet by no means can I come into his notion that the rich man is the representative of a Pharisee. And it is remarkable enough that the same circumstances upon which the author of the D. L. grounds this opinion, are more lately brought by a very learned critic in a celebrated work to prove the contrary.

Sadducæum *describi* (Luc. xvi. 19.) *ex divitiis, victu, amictu, et petitione patet. Pharisæi enim credebant animos esse superstites; jejunabant crebro; modestius vestiebantur; et pauperiores erant;* says the late professor *Wetstein* in loc.

Let us however examine the matter of fact a little more accurately.

"The capital errors of the Pharisees, saith "the author of the D. L. were avarice and lux-"ury." The charge with respect to the former of these errors, must be granted. But surely avarice was not the vice of this rich man; who seems rather to have been a waster of his substance with riotous living. And they who put it to his account upon the supposition that Lazarus lay at his gate unrelieved, take the liberty to suppose what cannot be proved from the parable.

Luxury on the other hand, and particularly the species of it here mentioned, was just as remote from the manners of the Pharisees. Grotius indeed says, "there were many among "the Pharisees who were rich above mediocri-"ty, and made an open ostentation of their "opulence in their apparel and their ban-"quets." And where is, or where ever was, the sect without its irregulars? The supposition is that our Saviour spake this parable to the Pharisees, as the leaders of a religious sect, distinguished by principles and rules of practice peculiar to themselves. Among the peculiarities of the Pharisees, the writers of the new testament point out, with great uniformity, a rigid precision in their external discipline, as the means by which they justified themselves before men, and maintained their authority with the people. With men of this character was Jesus now discoursing. And what warning could he be supposed to convey to them, by representing a person in a place of torment, whom, supposing him even to have been of their own sect in matters of opinion, they them-

selves would have disowned and reprobated for his manners ?

For the rest, the stress laid upon the word repent, in the D. L. is, I doubt, little more than an ingenious effort to serve a feeble hypothesis. Every one knows how often that word stands for the complex act of conversion, comprehending conviction with respect to erroneous principles, as well as reformation of vicious manners.

I do not mean by this to say that the parable was not spoken to the Pharisees ; the context puts that matter out of all reasonable doubt. On the contrary this very consideration, that the parable was addressed to the Pharisees, would be to me a convincing argument (if the point was not so evident in other respects) that the rich man was not intended to represent one of that fraternity.

It was the manner of our blessed Saviour to state cases to the Jews, and to the Pharisees in particular, upon principles of right and wrong, so plain and undeniable, that, where the application was kept out of sight, they could not avoid determining according to the reason of the thing, or the dictate of the law, even against themselves. Sometimes our Lord himself made the application in plain terms. Elsewhere he left the Jews to make it for themselves : but left it so obvious, that the Pharisees, we are told, upon some of these occasions, readily *perceived that the parable was spoken against them.* Instances of this may be seen, *Matth.* xxi. 28.---31, 40, 41. *Luke* vii. 41, 43. x. 30,---37, and *chap.* xv. throughout.

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is

one of these cases, stated in such terms as to oblige the Pharisees to assent to it ; which we may be sure they never would do, if a principal man of their own sect had been exhibited in a place of torment. For howsoever they might be persuaded of the reality of a future state of rewards and punishments, certain it is, they never dreamt that the latter would fall to the share of any one in communion with them. That a Sadducee might be there, they would find no difficulty to believe ; nor, consequently, to approve the propriety of Abraham's reasoning with one of those unbelievers.

This being premised, let us venture a step or two farther, and, in order to explain how this case is brought home to the Pharisees, look first into the introduction, and then into the contents of the parable itself.

The Pharisees, ver. 14, derided our Saviour for applying the maxim, *No man can serve two masters*, to them upon the supposition, that whoever kept the law of Moses, discharged his duty to God perfectly and completely ; and they, piquing themselves upon a strict observance of the law, the consequence would be that they were justified to all intents and purposes of the law ; which could not be supposed to condemn any practice, as the service of another master, that was consistent with a full conformity to the precepts and dictates therein delivered.

Our blessed Saviour however informs them, that this their boasted justification, really extended no farther than the approbation of men, who looked not beyond a conformity to the literal precept, but that with GOD who know-

eth the heart, many things *in high esteem with men, were abomination.*

Hence he proceeds to state the obligation of the law of Moses as it then stood.

The law and the prophets were until John: meaning, that till John, the whole dispensation of the old testament was in full force and virtue; but, *since that time,* says he, *the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.* Every man, men of all sorts, even men of the worst characters [Βιαται, *Matthew* xi. 12.] publicans and sinners, press into the kingdom of God, and find admittance, without being introduced by the formalities of the law.

This sounds as if the law and the prophets had, from this period, lost their whole efficacy and authority, and were no longer of any consideration as the means of attaining the kingdom of God. That no man therefore might entertain a mistake of that kind, our Lord immediately adds, *but it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.* Πεσειν, to fall to the ground without having its effect. See *Isaiah* lv. 11.

Now the law of Moses had already had its full and final effect in many respects: and, in those respects, had not failed. This therefore must be understood of some part of the law which had seemed to fail, but was now to recover its virtue and obligation: of which the following is an instance in point.

Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.

But say the Pharisees, Matth. xix. 7. *Why did* Moses *then command to give a writing of*

divorcement, and to put her away? Is not this a part of the law of Moses? And would Moses write a precept which should amount to no more than a cloke for the crime of adultery?

Our Lord replies, Moses, *because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.* i. e. "The precept of Moses was a mere "temporary dispensation, calculated for the "circumstances of the times, and the refrac-"tory disposition of you and your fathers, and "no part of the original law, which enjoins "that a man shall abide by his wife, even in "preference to his father and mother; and "therein virtually forbids, that they whom "God hath joined together, should be put "asunder by man." Now this permission to divorce their wives for any cause, was one of the ταυτηλα ἐν ἀνθρωποις, by which the Pharisees justified themselves before men: and, by the licentious abuse of it, was become little better than a dispensation for the sin of adultery, and an abomination to God. It was therefore high time it should be abolished, and the original law restored to its primitive dignity and authority.

And now, to confirm this doctrine, and to leave the Pharisees without any colour to object against it, our Saviour goes on to illustrate it by a similar case founded on the conduct of the Sadducees, who, not finding a future state of retribution in that which was properly, and strictly, the law given by Moses, concluded there were no grounds for it in any part of the law or the prophets.

For this purpose, a prosperous and luxurious

Sadducee is represented, as finding himself, after death, once more possessed of his life and faculties, but in a place of torment. He sees Lazarus, formerly a miserable object, well known to him upon earth, in a state of felicity, in company with Abraham the father of the faithful, and the friend of God; and conceiving from thence some hopes of relief, he petitions Abraham, that Lazarus might be permitted to administer some refreshment to him, to alleviate the extremity of his misery. But *Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented.* Adding a circumstance relative to the situation of the rich man and Lazarus, importing, that their several conditions were from thenceforward finally and irrevocably determined.

Τα αγαθα ΣΟΥ, THY good things; those things which only you esteemed good; εν τη ζωη ΣΟΥ, in THY life; in that life which only you believed. But in *that* life Lazarus received evil things. Therefore *now* here* [νυν ωδε] he is comforted; and [νυν ωδε in opposition to εν ζωη σου] thou art tormented.

It is here to be remarked, that no stress is laid upon the moral demeanor either of the rich man or Lazarus. Nor is the consolation or the torment set in the light of reward or punishment; but considered merely as balancing the good and evil of their earthly conditi-

* That ωδε is the true reading, and not ωδε, as in the common text, see Wetstein's various readings, and Bengelius's Apparatus in loc.

ons respectively. But to go on with the parable.

The condition of the rich man himself being thus comfortless and desperate, his next concern is to save his five brethren (Sadducees as well as himself) from his melancholy fate; which he supposes might be happily effected, by sending Lazarus to testify unto them the reality of a future world, and what reception Lazarus and himself had severally met with in it.

He proposes it to Abraham; and is answered, *they have* Moses *and the prophets, let them hear them.*

And what might they learn from Moses and the prophets?—Thus much at least, that as God, the judge of all the earth, would certainly do right, it could not be that Lazarus, an innocent man, should end his days in the extremest distress and misery as he had lived; while the rich man led and finished a life of ease, opulence, and the highest sensual gratifications in peace and honour; and that this was the last that should be heard of them for ever.

Now it happens that the prophet to whom Moses ascribes this principle, that *the judge of all the earth will do right,* was Abraham himself; so that they had no occasion to go even below Moses's own writings to seek it. And as the Sadducees certainly believed that God would do strict and impartial justice, at least in the present world, (notwithstanding the impiety of which some prejudiced writers have accused them*) the consequence was obvious,

* See Bayle's Dict. article SADDUCEES. Grotius's annotations upon Matth. xxii. 23. To suppose the Sadducees to deny a

when so remarkable an inequality was observed, with respect to the distribution of present good and evil, there must be a future life, where the righteousness of God would be fully justified.

The rich man however, who well remembered how he himself had heard and understood Moses and the prophets, knew likewise how little his brethren would edify by them. But is certain, that if one went unto them from the dead, his testimony would take effect with them, and bring about the complex act of repentance, a better faith, as well as better manners.

Abraham then answers for the last time, *if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.*

Why so? Because they would never believe any messenger whose commission, nor any message whose contents, they could not find in Moses and the prophets.

The thing to be testified was a matter of fact: and the messenger from the dead might, in ordinary cases, be a credible witness. But this being a fact of the utmost religious importance, it would be absurd to suppose Moses and the prophets should have passed it by, without the least notice. The credibility of the messenger therefore, would depend upon his being able to verify his message by the concurrent testimony of Moses and the prophets: and if that could be done to the satisfaction of the parties to be persuaded, Moses and the pro-

divine providence with respect to rewards and punishments in this world, is to suppose them not to believe a tittle of any part of the law of Moses.

phets might work their repentance without the messenger.*

The result is, that this parable would be spoken with the utmost propriety to the Pharisees, who being persuaded that, not only these premises in favour of a future retribution, but the conclusion too, were to be found in Moses and the prophets, would readily agree that the partial and prejudiced Sadducee was deservedly doomed to misery.

But then this was precisely their own case in the other instance. A strict adherence to the law given by Moses, joined to the desire of indulging an irregular appetite, rendered the Pharisees totally blind to the original law of marriage, which was so much older than Moses's dispensation; just as Moses's silence on the subject of future retribution in his institute, added to their own propensity to make the most of the present life, indisposed the Sad-

* Some of our modern pulpit orators, in applying the doctrine of Abraham to the gospel dispensation, have employed their rhetoric to shew how ineffectual the message of a ghost (which they dress out in various terrors for the purpose) would be to an infidel, whom Christ and his Apostles could not convince. The parable however exhibits no such case, nor countenances any such application. The man sent from the dead to the five brethren, it is plainly supposed, would have lost his labour, because and only because, those brethren did believe what they were able to find in Moses and the prophets. Had they paid no credit to Moses and the prophets in any thing, (which is supposed to be the disposition of our modern infidels towards the christian scriptures) no good reason can be given, why they should not believe the testimony of a credible person concerning a fact of which he had been an eye-witness. The testimony of a mere spectre indeed might justly be called in question. But the text mentions no such being. The witness *there* is, a *man* raised from the dead.

ducees for the consideration of what Moses and the prophets had said concerning the righteousness of God, in times that were prior to that institute, and long before it took place.

"It is certain, says the learned author of "the D. L. we must judge of the drift and "design of every rational discourse, from the "character of those to whom it is addressed." To this however must be added, the character of the speaker. Different men may argue and discourse in a very different manner with persons of the same character. Whether the learned writer in his explanation of this parable has paid sufficient regard either to the character of the Pharisees, or to our Lord's manner of arguing with them, in making the rich man the representative of a Pharisee, must now be left to the reader to determine.

Be it understood, however, that the parable, in the view we have taken of it, sends the Sadducees to Moses and the prophets for the proof of a future state of retribution, no otherwise than as it might be inferred from the righteousness of God; a point earnestly and repeatedly inculcated by Moses and all the prophets. This doctrine, it is supposed in the parable, compared with the appearances of things in this present life, and particularly in this last period of the Mosaic dispensation, might have convinced the Sadducees that some farther account would be taken hereafter. But for the full exemplification of the righteousness of God, in a state of rewards and punishments, they were referred to him of whom *Moses in the law, and the prophets, had spoken.*

But in this respect the Pharisees were no wiser or more believing than the Sadducees

themselves. And hence we perceive why they would be no more disposed to listen to Lazarus of Bethany, than the Sadducees would be persuaded by his namesake. Our Saviour indeed himself, and in his own person, says the very same thing to the Pharisees, in plain terms, that Abraham intimates to the Sadducee in the parable.

Had ye believed Moses, *ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how will ye believe my words?* *

Now had Lazarus of Bethany been raised from the dead by Jesus to call the Pharisees to repentance, he must have spoken to them the words of Jesus; namely, that they could no longer depend upon the law of Moses for their final justification; that all judgment was now committed to the Son by the Father; and that consequently to have eternal life, they must come unto Jesus.

But the Pharisees thought they had eternal life already in the writings of Moses, without any reference to Jesus; and while they so thought, neither the words nor the miracles of Jesus would make any impression upon them; because they did not see the connexion between Moses and Jesus. But had it been possible to have convinced them that Moses wrote of Jesus, the miracle might have been spared; they would have believed the words of Jesus without it.

* The Pharisees out of all doubt believed Moses, but did not believe that Moses had written of Jesus. With respect to this circumstance, they did not hear Moses, as it is expressed in the parable. So the Sadducees believed Moses and the patriarchal prophets in other things, but on the subject of a future state of retribution, as it was to be inferred from the righteousness of God, they would not hear them, and so far, but no farther, did not believe them.

A DEFENCE *of the* REMARKS *on* Dr. Warburton's *account of the sentiments of the early* Jews *concerning the soul, &c.* against the objections of *Caleb Fleming.*

MR. FLEMING having condescended to take notice of the above mentioned pamphlet, in his Survey of the search after souls, it would be very unpolite not to return the compliment. We announce then, to the world in our turn, the *candour* and *abilities* of this zealous defender of the *conscious scheme*, which perchance have hitherto laid in some obscurity.

There is indeed no hope that controversy should either be fairly carried on, or brought to any conclusion in due time, when one has to do with a man who sets up for a disputant without understanding the subject in debate. There is no end of a caviller who knows not when he is confuted. Had Mr. Fleming understood how to make a proper use of the just and seasonable rebuke he received from Mr. Peckard, the public had heard no more of him as an author. But he would write on, till even the Monthly Reviewers (who had said as much for his Survey as charity and compassion for a weak brother could reasonably demand) finding he still persisted to expose himself, threw him aside in a pet, and did but just save appearances of consistency, by treating the controversy itself directly, and Mr. Fleming's defence, only by implication, with an air of indifference.

They were in the right. Considering Mr. Fleming as a weak man, whose self conceit they

had over-fed by their indulgence of his survey, they took the proper method of reducing him by a little seasonable neglect. No man deserves to be maltreated for a mere defect in his intellects: and that, for ought these gentlemen knew, might be all the matter with this meek-spirited *Surveyor*. His want of honesty they seem not to have suspected, and if they had, it is probable they would have remitted him for his correction to the parties aggrieved, who indeed, in cases of this nature, best know their own sufferings.

The case between the *Remarker* and Mr. *Fleming* is this.

The learned author of the D. L. having cited *Eccles.* ix. 5. *The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten*, by way of proving that the early Jews had *no interesting speculations* on the soul's state of survivorship, the remarker says, p. 11. 12,—

"If this reflection (of Solomon) is supposed "to relate to the soul at all, it plainly gives it "up as absolutely lost to all the intents and "purposes of action and thought. Since then "the same consequences will follow from the "no interesting speculations of the antient "Jews, concerning the state of the soul after "death, as would follow from their belief that "the soul did not survive the body; and since "the Doctor has brought an authority from "scripture, to prove these no interesting spe-"culations, which, IF IT IS AT ALL TO "THE PURPOSE, represents the dead person, "soul as well as body, to be in a state of "utter insensibility, I would desire to know

" wherein consists the profligacy of ascribing " to the Doctor an opinion, which differs not " from that he professes to hold, save only in " a circumstance that amounts to just no- " thing."

The reader sees that the remarker gives no sense of his own to this text. His argument is this and this only. If this text relates to the soul, Solomon cannot be supposed to have believed the survivorship of the soul. If it does not relate to the soul, it is nothing to Dr. W's purpose.

At the distance of sixteen pages from this passage, when the remarker was got out of sight, and out of all concern with this text, there is the following remark, p. 29. 30.

" A future state, as taught by what men " call natural religion, supposes the soul to be " susceptible of happiness and misery, and " consequently of reward and punishment, " without the participation of the body. And " of this future state, the doctrine of the sepa- " rate existence of the soul, is indeed the basis, " or the preparatory doctrine. But a future " state, as taught by christian revelation, is a " future state into which the entrance is by " the door of a resurrection of the body ; a fu- " ture state in which men are placed by an im- " mediate act of the power and will of God ma- " nifested in a particular dispensation ; a fu- " ture state which stands, as to the mode of it, " independent of any principles of natural re- " ligion ; and which may be accomplished whe- " ther the soul survive the natural death of the " body or not.

The reader is requested to observe that the independency of the christian future state on any principles of natural religion, as to its mode, [meaning a resurrection of the body] and the possibility of its being accomplished, whether the soul survive the natural death of the body or not, are, in this passage, put singly and *solely on the power and will of God, manifested in a particular dispensation.* Not the least mention of, or reference to, the text in Ecclesiastes whatsoever.

Once more; at page 31, of the Remarks, &c. is a citation from a letter of Dr. Warburton, to the late Dr. Middleton, importing that "the future state of revelation stands immedi-"ately on its being a restoration to a lost in-"heritance, purchased by a redeemer."

Whether this notion of the future state of revelation is true or not, the Remarker does not concern himself in the least. His business there is only to observe, that if Moses believed the future state of revelation, as it is here represented, he could not believe a future state founded on the natural immortality of the soul. "For what, says he, is this lost inheritance "but life and immortality? And what occa-"sion to be restored to that by purchase, which "mankind already have by nature?"

Let now the equitable reader judge whether the man who penned the following paragraph was fitter for a mansion of confinement, or one of correction.

Survey of the Search, &c. chap. vii. sect. 1. p. 181.

"In support of the other opinion, *Eccles.* "ix. 5. is produced by another advocate of

" soul-sleeping. [*Remarks on* Dr. Warburton's " *account, &c.* p. 11. 12.] *The dead know not* " *any thing, neither have they any more a re-* " *ward, for the memory of them is forgotten.* " HENCE *a future state, as to its mode,* is inde- " pendent on any principles of natural religion; " and which may be accomplished whether the " soul survive the natural death of the body or " not. *So that* it is a restoration to a lost inheri- " tance purchased by a redeemer, p. 30. 31.

Here, besides the roguery of connecting these distant and unrelated passages of the remarks, with his HENCE and his SO THAT, as immediately belonging to one another; the reader will observe that there is not one word of the christian future state, or the future state of revelation, to which the mode of a resurrection, in the Remarks, hath respect. Not one syllable of the power and will of God manifested in a particular dispensation, upon which, and which only, the accomplishment in question is made to depend. To such a variety of falsification was this candid writer reduced before he could get his own nonsense fixed upon the remarker. After which he goes on thus.

" This is surely to discard any natural prin- " ciples or capacities, by conclusions which " are far beyond the compass of all possible con- " ception."

Whose fault is that? The Surveyor himself had the making of the premises as well as of the conclusion; and if he managed so as to set himself fast in his own cobweb, the more simpleton he.

" A future state, says he, in the utmost amaze-

"ment, accomplished, whether the soul does "or does not survive the death of the body."

Yes, what does the man stare at? Will he undertake to prove that the soul survives the body by virtue of any natural principle of immortality? No, he disowns the doctrine. Will he then prove, that, supposing the soul not to survive the body, God cannot restore it? No, he attempts not to prove any thing. He only takes upon him to conceive; how wisely we shall see presently. It is really hard upon the surveyor, that after he has been at the pains to make a case for his opponents, which is beyond the possibility of his own conception, he should not be able to puzzle other people with it.

"And that because of a restoration to a lost "inheritance!" No, Sir, because of the will and power of God manifested in a particular dispensation. The other *because* is your own, and may serve, if you have any sense and probity left, to shew you the impertinence of what follows, viz. "A restoration of what? Of a "soul not surviving the death of the body." Where the question is put in the terms of Dr. W. and the answer given in those of the Remarker. So far, however, as these two points are related to each other, Mr. Peckard has given him the true answer, and in his hands we leave it.

"But why, says the Surveyor, may we not "rather conceive of the soul as possessing "principles of life and immortality from its "sincere piety and extensive virtue?"

That is to say, why may we not conceive moral habits and natural principles to be the

very same things? Why may we not conceive the horse to possess his pack-saddle, for the same ends and uses, and by the same title, that the camel possesses its bunch? What is there that a fanatical *réveur* may not conceive?

"Is it imagined, says he, the text in Eccle-
"siastes produced, will determine in the pre-
"sent debate?"

So it seems the Surveyor had the assurance to imagine *for* the Remarker. But by his question, one would hope, his conscience was now reminding him of the ninth commandment.

And pray, Sir, what is the present debate? As you have stated it yourself in what goes before, it appears to be, whether a future state does or does not depend on any principles of natural religion; and whether it may not be accomplished, even though the soul should not survive the natural death of the body? And, weak as you are, you cannot be so ignorant a man as not to know that the citations you bring from p. 30, 31, of the remarks on Dr. W's account, &c. curtailed and mangled as they stand in your own Survey, could not possibly furnish you with any subject of debate but on these questions. If you did not understand these points as the Remarker had stated them, you should, as an honest man, have confessed your ignorance. If, after you had stated them your own way, you still found them above your hand, you should, as a prudent man, have left them unnoticed. But to represent the Remarker as building those propositions on a text in Ecclesiastes, only because he happened to cite that text on another occasion, must for ever ruin all your pretensi-

ons to probity and candour, unless you chuse to redeem them at the expence of your whole stock of common sense.

But once more, what is the present debate? Why, quite metamorphosed in an instant. It no longer relates to the modes, dependencies, or accomplishment of a future state in general, or of the christian future state in particular, but only to the future expectations of the Jews; a matter with which the Remarker has nothing in the world to do, and for the discussion of which he most willingly turns over the Surveyor to the appointed examiner of a certain *dirty heap*, where the said Surveyor may hope to make some figure among much more considerable men.

However, as the Surveyor seems to have dedicated this whole paragraph to the service of the Remarker on Dr. W's account, &c. let us try to edify by his exposition of Eccles. ix. 5.

"I should be of opinion, says the Surveyor, "it is nothing at all to the purpose. For the "context will shew that the dead not knowing, "only has reference to the utter or total dis- "abilities and disappointment of the worlding, "for farther attention, whose schemes are all "thus rendered abortive and fruitless."

One cannot but wish it were possible to make either grammar, or sense without grammar, of this profound period, if it was only for Solomon's sake, who, it seems, is to stand good for the meaning of it. Often have we met with commentators upon Solomon. But here Solomon himself turns commentator on the Survey. "Id est, *whose love and hatred* "*and envy are now perished, neither has he*

"*any more a portion for ever in any thing un-*
"*der the sun,* v. 6."

The misfortune is that Solomon, in his new capacity, is made to contradict himself. For what he predicates, as a commentator, of the *worldling* only, as a preacher, he most clearly and expressly affirms of the *dead in general.* Verse 4. *To him that is joined to all living there is hope.* Are none but worldlings joined to all living? To him therefore, who is *not* joined to all living, there is *no* hope.——*For a living dog is better than a dead lion.* How so? Is it because the lion is, and the dog is not totally deprived of its vital powers and capacities? Or because the schemes of the lion, as a worldling, are all thus rendered abortive and fruitless? Verse 5. For the living know [something, they know at least] that they shall die. But the dead know not any thing; two words which Mr. Surveyor hath thought proper to leave behind him.

The plain case is this. Solomon in the 5th verse affirms that the understandings, in the 6th, that the passions and affections of all the dead, are utterly extinguished. Of those who had been, in their life-time, the most excellent of mankind, (compared to the lion) to whom the meanest among the living (compared to the dog) are in these respects preferred.

Hold, says the Surveyor, this only has reference to the schemes of the worldling, whose reward and portion are under the sun. The consequence of which interpretation is, that to those who are dead and have not been worldlings, there is hope, a reward, a portion.—— Where? Why under the sun, for of any hope,

reward, or portion elsewhere, there is not the least mention.

"So that the conjecture can have no sup-
"port, says the Surveyor, when *it* would have
"us think the Jews were void of future ex-
"pectations."

When the conjecture would have us *think!* —He means, I suppose, that they who think the Jews were void of future expectations, can have no support from this text. If any one has cited this text for that purpose, it was not he who wrote the remarks on Dr. Warburton's account, &c. But I will tell the Surveyor what this text will support. It will support, as far as it goes, the conjecture that the Jews knew nothing of a separate existence of the soul after the death of the body, or of any immediate restoration of the *dead* to life and consciousness, by the way of an *undressing* scheme.

But let us see how he would prove that the Jews were not void of future expectations.

"What man could ever love God with all
"his heart and mind and soul and strength
"(which was a first principle in the Mosaic
"system) and yet be void of the desire and
"expectation of immortality? I presume it
"is absolutely impossible."

Thus it is that fanaticism, whether in religion or philosophy, is for ever presuming and forming hypotheses against matter of fact. *In the writing of Hezekiah King of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness*, are the most manifest tokens (if words can make any thing manifest) that the writer had no future expectations. Yet he was one *who had walked before the* LORD *in truth, and*

with a perfect heart, and had done that which was good in his sight. Which are the surest evidences that he had *loved* GOD *with all his heart*, &c. The writers however who oppose the main proposition in the D. L. always find some means of evading the force of this testimony, by putting different constructions on these passages, according to their several talents and apprehensions.

My business is only with the Surveyor, who, to be consistent with himself, must have his way of escaping from this inconvenient representation, and of proving, that Hezekiah had the desire and expectation of immortality.

Very well. Hezekiah is summoned to take possession of this immortality. He desires to be excused. He pleads for a longer life upon earth. He even alleges his love of God as a reason why he should be indulged in his request. He weeps sore at the thoughts of being parted from his earthly connections, and behaves upon this occasion in all respects like a man, who, whatever his expectations might be, was void of all desire of immortality in another world, as long as it was possible to preserve his life in this. That Hezekiah was what he pretended to be, a lover of God, stronger proof cannot be given, than that God *heard his prayer, and added to his life fifteen years.*

Does not this presuming Surveyor now perceive that he has imposed upon himself, and would impose upon his readers the idea of immortality in a future state as the object of the good man's natural desires, and expectations, instead of the preservation of life, simply taken? Does he not see that the question, whether the

Jews were void of future expectations, is a question of fact? If it can be proved that God thought fit to give a law to the Jews, and to inforce obedience to that law by temporal promises and threatnings only, while those of a future state were purposely concealed from them, to what will his idle presumption (that no man could love God under such a law) amount, but to this, that he the said Surveyor knows the various complexities of sentiment, affection, and disposition, incident to the human mind in all possible circumstances, better than God himself? A postulatum indeed quite necessary for all the fabricators of moral meetnesses I have ever yet seen. But if Mr. Fleming desired to have credit for so large a fund of penetration, he should not have published his Survey. For the rest, if he hath a mind to overset the florid scheme of the D. L. he must try his strength upon the matter of fact.

"I am not conscious, says the Surveyor, of "having misrepresented any of the reasonings, "or of having omitted any of the fundamental "principles which I have met withal in a sur-"vey of those inquiries within mentioned." Introduction, p. iv.

A man may have, it seems, a book before him, write out particular passages, refer to particular pages, and still be unconscious whether he has followed his copy or not!—Perhaps he means he feels no compunction for misdeeds of this kind. Either way he is a proper object of reprehension, which indeed he deserves in a much severer degree, for his usage of the very book which set him up for a Surveyor.

I mean that collection of tracts which he de-

scribes sometimes as consisting of two,* sometimes of three† volumes, to which he hath given the fictitious title of *A Search after souls*, which he, with the most unfeeling assurance, ascribes to Dr. Coward, and finally affirms to have been published in the year 1706; in all which there is not one word of truth. For,

1. Dr. Coward never wrote any book whose title was—*A Search after souls.*

2. There never was any book with that title either in two or in three volumes.

3. The *Search after souls* in two parts, makes but two tracts of fourteen which are generally bound together in two volumes, quarto.

4. Of any of these tracts there never was more than one impression. They were printed at different times. The first, which is called *Observations upon a Sermon, &c.* viz. Dr. Bentley's second sermon at Boyle's lecture, was printed and published in the year 1694; the rest as occasion was given, by the several pieces to which they reply, and all of them before the death of the author, which happened October 18, 1705.

5. That this author was not Dr. Coward, appears from several passages in the said tracts, all of them disclaiming all concern with the *Second thoughts, &c.* or with Dr. Coward the author of that book; and from a passage in the *Observations on Dr. Nicholls's Conference with a Theist*, it is evident that the author of those Observations had *then* never seen Dr. Coward's

* Survey, 94. † Intrd. xiii.

Second Thoughts. So accurate and diligent is this sagacious surveyor, in his endeavours to *gratify the curious.*

6. The author of these tracts was Henry Layton, Esq, whose father Francis Layton, Esq. was some time master of the Jewel house to King Charles I. The copy I use belonged to a very learned Clergyman deceased, who was nephew to Mr. Henry Layton, and who hath added on the blank leaves and margins, several manuscript notes, relating to the author and his antagonist. The first volume has no title page the second has one, viz. "Arguments and replies in a dispute concerning "the nature of the human soul, viz. whether "the same be immaterial separately subsisting, and intelligent; or be material, unintelligent, and extinguishable at the death of "the person. London, printed in the year 1703."

It is true, some of these tracts, particularly the last in answer to Dr. Sherlock, must have been printed after the above mentioned date. The rest probably were most of them printed sooner, and the date of the title-page ascertained from the greater number. However, as it is certainly known, that all these tracts were printed in the author's life time, it is plain the Surveyor is under some delusion with respect to the date he gives, p. 94, of his Survey.

For the rest, the gentleman to whom the above-mentioned copy now belongs, has in his hands the original manuscripts of some of these very tracts, and several others both on the same and other subjects written by the late Mr.

Henry Layton. And he gives me authority to say that he proposes, as soon as his avocations will allow, to oblige the public with a particular account of this extraordinary person and his writings; when Mr. Layton will be fully vindicated from the cavils and misrepresentations of this self conceited Surveyor.

A

SECOND POSTSCRIPT,

Occasioned by Mr. Fleming's *late* Advertisement *concerning a Misnomen in his Survey.*

WHEN I first met with this *Misnome N* in the news-paper, I took it for a *Misnome R* of the printer; but finding it repeated both in the title and text of the Advertisement, it seems to be intended for a present to the Dictionary-makers, whose collections may likewise be enriched by an *Addend A*, contributed by the same *learned* hand.

Various are the apologies offered by the Surveyor, for his mistaking the author and title of the books he pretends to answer. "It "is said, after above half a century, that the "volumes he hath cited as written by Dr. "Coward, were the work of Henry Layton, "Esq.—He was imposed upon by a spurious "title-page.—He did not examine the second "volume (which by the way, would have set "him right) with any care," &c.

Why would he then, inveloped in all these clouds of ignorance, pretend, with so much parade, to gratify the curious, in a matter where his leading intention ought to have been accurate information?

I had said, "There never was any book "with that title, viz. *A search after souls*, "either in two volumes or in three." I had

said likewise, that "*A search after souls*, in "*two* parts, makes but *two* tracts of *fourteen*, "which are generally bound together in two "volumes quarto."

"These, says the Surveyor, like two duelists, "point at the heart of each other."

I wish the stupidity of this remark (which imports that, in our Surveyor's ideas, two are equal to fourteen) may be its worst fault. There is, methinks, something in this savage allusion, that seems to indicate what sort of duelist this man would be, if kind fortune had not shortened his horns.

My complaint is, not that the Surveyor hath simply mistaken me, or barely made a citation from my pamphlet; but that he hath first wilfully misrepresented me by an unfair and dishonest citation, and then insulted me, for drawing nonsensical conclusions, which are his own manufacture. If these were innocent mistakes, his most indulgent friends must allow, that he is wholly unqualified to meddle in the controversy.

As to the text itself, *Eccles.* ix. 5. He is a little too late, for his own justification, in discovering the sense I give it, except he could shew that I had grafted upon that sense, the inferences he ascribes to me.

He makes no doubt "but Hezekiah would "have gone to Martyrdom, on any great and "proper occasion, and have been able and "ready to shew the superiority of the desire of "immortality, to that of the preservation of "the animal life."

Whence we learn, that to be called by an express message from God to leave this mortal

life, is no great or proper occasion of shewing the superiority of the desire of immortality, to that of the preservation of the animal life.

" Witness, says he, the martyrs for Truth." That is to say, witness the men who spake and acted just contrary to Hezekiah.

" But this fondness for the present life in " Hezekiah, was but the instinctive animal im- " pression, under which the best of men, who " supremely desire immortality, in a future " state are wisely put." The old refuge of all visionaries, to play hypothesis against matter of fact. Hezekiah most evidently did not supremely desire immortality. His instinctive animal impressions (to use the Surveyor's conceited phrase) were plainly supreme on this occasion; which is but little to Hezekiah's honour, if he had any knowledge of immortality in a future state. Since, where immortality is plainly revealed, (as in the Gospel) the command is to subdue and mortify this instinctive animal impression. But if you believe the Surveyor, Hezekiah was wisely put under two supreme and contradictory desires and impressions at the same instant. Have I not reason to be supremely chagrined, that so able an head should conceive my reasonings about Hezekiah to be fanciful and groundless?

Concerning the sentiments of the early Jews about a future state in general, the Reviewer hath no difference with Dr. W. the present Bishop of Gloucester; nor did he ever promise a whit better representation of those sentiments, than is given by that learned writer. Let the Surveyor go and learn the subject of that controversy, before he pretends to make his ignorant and invidious remarks upon it.

"Solomon, says the Surveyor, could declare, "that *in the way of righteousness is life, and* "*in the path-way thereof no death.*" And so could Solomon's lawgiver declare too, "*The* "*man that doeth them shall live in them.* And, "*It shall be our righteousness if we observe to* "*do all these commandments.*" But then saith James, *he that offendeth in one point, is guilty of all.* And that guilt, according to the law, bringeth forth death. What now becomes of of Solomon's life, unless he redeems it by a legal atonement? And where is the man that could pretend to life upon the strict condition of the law? These are circumstances of which our Surveyor seems not to have the remotest conception. And yet how easily might he have informed himself of the true state of the case, by consulting the apostle Paul? "*If* "*there had been a law, which could have given* "*life* (δυναμενος ζωο ποιησαι, able to quicken or make "alive the dead) *verily righteousness would* "*have been by the law.*" *But the Scripture hath shut up all* [things] *under sin;* i. e. hath left no way open to this ζωο ποιησις, but by *the seed* to whom the promise was made. Solomon's way of righteousness, therefore, would never have led him to immortality, unless Paul was mistaken. The Surveyor had so base luck with this same Solomon once before, that he was much to blame to meddle with him again.

Instead of affecting to say (what indeed I never said) that the Surveyor hath no ideas, I would rather affect to say that he hath too many, unless they were of a better sort, or were not jumbled together in a mere chaos. But that he does not understand the subject he writes

about, I not only affect to say, but to prove from this very Advertisement, in which he affects to oppose what they, whom he calls materialists, (without reviling them, to be sure) never held; namely, that the resurrection-body will not be of a spiritual nature.

And yet, when he hath the whole field to himself, he makes such miserable work with his absurd comments upon the Apostle Paul, that one cannot but wish he had kept himself to his original subject of mechanism, instead of setting up for a teacher in a science of which he hath yet the lowest elements to learn.

But let us see what he brings forth, in the province where he is likely to meet with more opposition.

His position is, "That good men, in all ages "of the world, have had a spiritual body given "them, antecedent to these ministrations of "the Saviour."

To prove this, he quotes, and tacks together, according to custom, three detached verses of the 5th chapter of St. John's Gospel; leaving out the intermediate passages, which absolutely confutes what he attempts to build on the mutilated citation.

John v. 19, 20, 21, "The son (of man, adds "the Surveyor, too keep his hand in at falsi- "fication) the Son, saith our Lord, can do no- "thing of himself, but what he seeth the Fa- "ther do; for what things soever he doeth these "also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father "loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things "that himself doeth; and HE WILL SHEW HIM "GREATER WORKS THAN THESE, that ye may "marvel. FOR as the Father raiseth up the

" dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son " quickeneth whom he will."

The 20th verse, which is here distinguished in italics and capitals, is left out, as manifestly subversive of the Surveyor's whole system.

" The Father will shew the Son greater " works than these."——Greater works than which?——Greater works than these he sheweth him hitherto. And consequently greater works than he [the Father] hitherto doeth. For the Father sheweth the Son ALL THINGS that himself doeth.—What works then are they which are greater than the Father hitherto doeth or sheweth the Son; but which he will shew him?—Plainly, raising and quickening the dead.—The consequence is inevitable.—The Father had not raised and quickened the dead, in all ages of the world.

But admit the Father had done and shewn the Son these greater works, antecedently to the Son's ministration; once more, what works are they?—Not the works of giving spiritual bodies to all good men; but the works of raising and quickening the dead. And as these are works at which the Jews would marvel, when they should be wrought by the Son, they must have been works which, when wrought by the Father, had fallen within the notice of mankind. This circumstance limits them to the few instances of resuscitation, recorded in the old testament; which are not only too few for the Surveyor's system, but, what is worse, did not reach to immortality.

Again, v. 25, 26, " *Verily, verily, I say unto* " *you, the hour is coming and now is, when the* " *dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God;*

"*and they that hear shall live.* For as the "Father hath life in himself, so hath he given "to the Son to have life in himself."

The Surveyor hath here again dropped the unfavourable verse, which would have shewn, that the giving spiritual bodies to good men, immediately upon their decease, had not been the constant and stated operation of Almighty power from the beginning of the world. That the Father hath life in himself is clear, from his giving life and breath, and all things, to the whole creation. But what argument can be raised from hence, that he hath given immortality to all good men from the beginning of the world? And, if that is the case, who are the dead that shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and, in consequence of hearing, shall live? The wicked only, says the Surveyor, with great composure; in contradiction to, and in defiance of, the three verses immediately following.

Let us try to shame him by an instance in point. David was a man after God's own heart, and is proposed as an example to all his successors. We may be certain then, that whatever is become of David, he is not reckoned among the wicked. But, says the Apostle Peter, David *is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day; neither is* David *ascended into the heavens.*—David, *says* St. Paul, *after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption.* It is plain, Peter thought that all the remains of David were yet in the sepulchre, and that no part of David was yet ascended into the

heavens: and Paul is positive that David saw corruption. All which assertions, and what is built upon them by these Apostles, are mere fanciful and groundless reasonings, if, according to the Surveyor, David had a spiritual body given him immediately upon his departure out of this mortal life. And if David had not such a spiritual body given him upon his demise, I should be glad to know who had.

For the rest, the compliment paid him in the Remarks, which is, that he had stumbled upon some right principles, is heartily at the Surveyor's service; and when he does so again (which is not impossible, considering his itch to be flouncing every way in the dark) I shall not be backward to repeat it.

"But the same pen under the Reviewer hath "abundantly reviled him."

Which puts one in mind of Jonathan Wild's defence at the Old Bailey, where he pleaded that he ought not to be hanged for being a *thief* himself, because he had once been a thief-*catcher*.

It becomes the Surveyor, no doubt, to complain of being reviled, who, with so little knowledge of his subject, and so slender talents for investigating any truths that lie below the surface of a school-boy's literature, presumes to insult so many men of superior abilities with the most malicious petulance; particularly the worthy master of Peter-house, against whom (after the grossest blundering and misrepresentation) his stupid sneers are directed with a singular malignity. And for what? Because, forsooth, Dr. Law hath represented eternal life, as an additional privilege conferred on man

by God, through the gospel; or, in other words, as the purchase of our Saviour and Redeemer Christ. And hath this penetrating Surveyor brought any thing to overthrow this important doctrine? That will be seen in its place. In the mean time, the following passage is recommended to the Surveyor's serious meditation.

"I appeal to every impartial man that reads "the scripture fairly in any translation, whe- "ther it were possible for writers to make use "of words and phrases more proper to convey "this sentiment, that the death of Christ was "propitiatory, and the procuring cause of the "remission of sin (and consequently of eter- "nal life) to every believer,—than what they "have done in the new testament."

These are the words of a shrewd and sensible deist in a late printed letter, addressed to the Rev. Mr. B——n, an eminent dissenting minister in Norwich, which, I think, it concerns our Surveyor as much as Mr. B——n (and both of them in a very high degree) to answer in a manner satisfactory to all serious christians. And then it will probably be seen, "whose "notions they are, that furnish the unbeliever "with a full half, at least, of his effective wea- "pons against christianity,"* by representing it as rising no higher, either in its design or effects, than a fanciful religion of nature.

As I have a little room to spare, I am tempted to employ it in observing, that the compilers of the Monthly Review for September last, having said a few civil things of the foregoing

* See Fleming's Survey, p. 199.

Review, &c. close their character of it thus: "In regard, however, to the sentiments of the "early Jews concerning the soul, &c. nothing "is advanced in this Review, that can throw "any new light upon the subject."—Had these critics thought the pamphlet worth a little more of their attention, they might have perceived that the author, instead of pretending to throw new light upon the sentiments of the early Jews concerning the soul, had expressed his opinion with some freedom, and, as he thinks, not without some proof, that the early Jews had no sentiments or conceptions at all concerning the soul, considered as a principle of life and consciousness distinct from and independent of the body. To throw new light upon the subject, is the province of those whom he opposes; particularly as the old light that has been thrown upon it, seems now to be reduced to its last glimmerings; and the cruse from which it has been supplied from time to time, drained to the very dregs.

E N D.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01096 6903

DATE DUE

JAN [illegible] 1995			
AUG 1 [illegible] 1995			
AUG 1 [illegible]			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.